IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Case No. 1:16-CR-082-1 3 4 (Judge Kane) VS. 5 WILLIAM CHANDLER AUGUSTA, Defendant 6 TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS 7 BEFORE THE HONORABLE YVETTE KANE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE OCTOBER 31, 2017; 10:00 A.M. 8 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 9 FOR THE GOVERNMENT: 10 Meredith A. Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney United States Attorney's Office 11 228 Walnut Street, Second Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 12 13 Austin M. Berry, Trial Attorney United States Department of Justice Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section 14 1400 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 600 15 Washington, D.C. 20005 FOR THE DEFENDANT: 16 17 Heidi R. Freese, Federal Public Defender Federal Public Defender's Office 100 Chestnut Street, Suite 306 18 Harrisburg, PA 17101 19 ALSO PRESENT: 20 Crystal Bard, United States Probation Officer 21 Lori A. Shuey Federal Certified Realtime Reporter 22 United States Courthouse 228 Walnut Street, P.O. Box 983 23 Harrisburg, PA 17108-0983 2.4 717-215-1270 lori shuey@pamd.uscourts.gov 25 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1	INDEX
2	
3	DEFENSE WITNESSES
4	LOUISE LUCK, M.A. PAGE
5	Direct Examination by Ms. Freese 9
6	Cross-Examination by Ms. Taylor 75 Redirect Examination by Mr. Freese 91 Recross-Examination by Mr. Taylor 96
7	RICHARD KRUEGER, M.D. PAGE
8	
9	Direct Examination by Ms. Freese 31 Examination by The Court 72 Cross-Examination by Mr. Berry 97
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Berry 97 Redirect Examination by Ms. Freese 152
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. We're here on the Augusta matter. I understand there's a preliminary matter that needs to be addressed.

MR. BERRY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Berry.

MR. BERRY: Good to see you again. There's an issue with regards to Rule 26.2, which under the rule says that after the defense puts on a witness, I have an opportunity to stand up and make a motion before the court to ask for prior statements of that witness that are within the subject matter of his or her testimony.

It is a rule that I think is not as often utilized or understood in many contexts, and so in the interest of efficiency, I reached out to Ms. Freese last week and advised her that I would be making that motion. I realize it's not a rule of discovery, that I was not entitled to receive that in advance of this hearing, but I just wanted her to know that I would be doing that today at the conclusion of her witnesses' testimony, specifically Dr. Krueger.

There was some back and forth between Ms. Freese and I. She provided some documents and then basically took the position that she doesn't think that the email correspondence between her or her staff and Dr. Krueger or Ms. Luck would come within the rule. Our reading of the rule is essentially that if she believes that some of that is privileged -- certainly

things like her own emails to them very likely would be excluded, but the witnesses' statements back should come within the rule, in our view.

But in any event, what the rule says is, if you believe that some of that is privileged, then you're to provide that in camera for Your Honor to review and to make an in-camera decision without my input as to whether I'm entitled to it or not, and that's sort of the stalemate that we're at right now.

The last communication that we received from the defense was that the defense was not going to conduct a server search for these emails, and so I don't know the status, whether they've been gathered, whether they're available for Your Honor to review, anything along those lines, but I do know that it will be an issue because I will make that motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Berry, is Dr. Krueger the only witness involved in this 26.2 dispute?

MR. BERRY: No. To be fair, to be candid, I think I only initially asked for Dr. Krueger, not thinking about sort of -- we sort of divided and conquered here and not thinking about Ms. Luck, but she is calling, the defense is calling two witnesses, and so it would apply to both of those witnesses.

And specifically what I think exists, just to be clear, and I don't think it's a large volume of material, but I don't know -- just through experience, I suspect that it's not

a large volume of material -- that it would likely be email correspondence with these witnesses about the subject matter of their testimony that may or may not comport with their reports and what they're going to say on the stand. And that is essentially the purpose of 26.2, is to provide us an opportunity to compare and contrast those statements. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Freese. MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor. I concur with the chronological request that was made by the government. Late last week the request was made for Dr. Krueger, and yesterday morning the request was made with respect to Ms. Luck. I have carefully reviewed the rule, and to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

perfectly candid with the court, that is correct, this is the first time I've received such a request from the government in relation to my work product with my agents, with my experts, or with witnesses that I've retained in this matter.

I've reviewed the rule carefully, and I've also reviewed a number of decisions, including this court's decisions in the civil context, and my initial position is that in order to be a statement under the rule, it would have to be relevant to the subject matter.

So in an abundance of caution -- my position is that it's not discoverable, that it doesn't fall under the rule. the court determines that, in fact, it potentially does, my position is that it is privileged work product and that it

falls specifically under that doctrine.

Because I did not want to delay these proceedings, I, in an abundance of caution, do have with me today the emails. Late last night my staff and I did conduct a server search, and I have correspondence. It is not redacted because of the time constraints. It is simply PDFs of my email communications with both Dr. Krueger and Ms. Luck.

So I do have it available, and as I indicated to the court -- or, excuse me, to the government yesterday, obviously I would comply with any court order. But my initial position is that -- which is why my initial response to -- which was quoted in the United States' sentencing memorandum was that I don't think such a statement exists, because I was simply thinking about a traditional statement that I would request from the government, which is why I don't typically request their emails with their agents about strategy, about things like that, because I consider that to be work product.

So that's the state of affairs. I did not turn it over to the government because I didn't believe, frankly, that I could without a court order or that it fell within the rules of criminal procedure.

THE COURT: So what you're saying is that you have a collection of emails that may be, in the court's view, covered by the rule?

MS. FREESE: Today with me, Your Honor, yes. Late

```
last night I did compile PDFs of my email correspondence --
1
     again, I believe that this is as comprehensive as I can
2
3
     obtain -- my email correspondence with Dr. Krueger and my email
4
     correspondence with Ms. Luck.
              THE COURT: And is it your view that all of the
5
6
     documents contained on that device are work product?
7
              MS. FREESE: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. Counsel, how many witnesses do
8
9
     you have here today?
              MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I have two professional
10
     witnesses, Louise Luck, who I'm not offering as an expert but
11
     who is a historian, you know, for the client.
12
13
              THE COURT: Right.
              MS. FREESE: And I have Dr. Krueger. And then I have
14
15
     three individuals who -- what I would call would be more
     traditional reading a statement to the court who have been
16
17
     acquainted with my client throughout his life.
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, I propose that we proceed as
18
19
               I would like -- I heard you say Dr. Krueger, and
20
     Mr. Berry said Dr. Krueger. Which one is it?
21
              MS. FREESE: It is Dr. Krueger.
22
              THE COURT: It's Krueger. Okay.
23
              MS. FREESE: It's Dr. Krueger.
24
              THE COURT: All right. Let's hear from Dr. Krueger,
25
     and then we'll move on --
```

MR. BERRY: I think she wants to go with Ms. Luck 1 first. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MS. FREESE: That is correct, Your Honor. I thought 4 it made chronological sense to start with Ms. Luck. 5 6 THE COURT: Sure, however you want to go. Let's hear from the witnesses, and then we'll see where we are with these 7 objections. 8 9 MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor. Ms. Luck. 10 MR. BERRY: Could we ask that Dr. Krueger step out of 11 the courtroom? 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I would request, because he has reviewed her report and her report and social history was 14 15 part of his opinion in this matter, because he's an expert witness, that he be permitted to remain in the courtroom. 16 17 MR. BERRY: Experts are typically allowed to remain in the courtroom to view, for example, the government's experts 18 19 and witnesses, but to the extent that he's going to watch the 20 cross-examination of this witness to help aid him in the 21 cross-examination, I think that's precisely what's not fair and what the rule excludes from him. 22 He doesn't need to see her testimony to form the basis 23 24 of his opinion. As she said, he's already read her report, so 25 he should be excluded.

THE COURT: All right. I agree that he should be 1 excluded. 2 LOUISE LUCK, M.A., called as a witness, having been duly 3 sworn or affirmed, testified as follows: 4 5 COURTROOM DEPUTY: For the record, please state your 6 full name. 7 THE WITNESS: Louise Luck. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Could you spell your last name, 8 9 please. 10 THE WITNESS: Luck, L-u-c-k. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. You may be seated. 11 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. FREESE: 14 15 Ms. Luck, good morning. 16 A. Good morning. 17 Q. I'm going to note before we get started that there's a large binder up there on the witness stand, and that's simply 18 to assist you with some of the documents that you reviewed 19 20 should you be asked about them. Okay? 21 A. Great. Thank you so much. 22 Q. Okay. Very good. Ms. Luck, if you could, please indicate to the court what your educational background is. 23 24 A. I have a master's in community psychology from Marist 25 College in Poughkeepsie, New York.

- 1 Q. Okay. And how are you currently employed?
- 2 A. I am the director and mitigation specialist for Court
- 3 Consultation Services, a business that I started myself almost
- 4 30 years ago.
- 5 Q. Okay. Now, do you also have experience with the New York
- 6 Department of Corrections?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. In what capacity?
- 9 A. Well, I started -- my first job while I was still in school
- 10 | obtaining my master's was an Orange County probation officer.
- 11 Q. Okay.
- 12 A. I did supervision and writing of reports on juvenile
- 13 probationers. Then I went on to the adult division, and I
- 14 worked there a number of years doing investigations and
- 15 | supervision of clients.
- 16 Q. And let me just stop you. When you say "investigations,"
- 17 do you mean presentence investigations?
- 18 **A.** Yes, yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. Go ahead and continue.
- 20 A. Okay. And after that, I took a position with the New York
- 21 State Division of Parole where I was an institutional parole
- 22 officer. I prepared parole memorandums for incarcerated
- 23 individuals, and I also, for a period of time, worked for the
- 24 Department of Corrections as a correction counselor doing
- 25 classification of inmates.

- 1 Q. Okay. In your capacity as director of Court Consultation
- 2 Services, have you prepared any social history reports for what
- 3 we call juvenile lifers in Pennsylvania?
- 4 A. Yes, I have.
- 5 Q. Now, have you previously testified in court?
- 6 | A. Oh, yes.
- 7 Q. Approximately how many times?
- 8 A. 30, 40.
- 9 Q. Okay. Have you ever testified in the Middle District of
- 10 Pennsylvania?
- 11 A. Yes, I have.
- 12 \blacksquare Q. Did you prepare in this matter, were you retained by the
- 13 Federal Public Defender's Office to conduct a social history
- 14 and background investigation in this case?
- 15 A. I was.
- 16 Q. And did you, in fact, conduct that background
- 17 investigation?
- 18 **A.** I did.
- 19 Q. Now, in preparation and during your investigation, did you
- 20 review a number of documents?
- 21 A. Yes, I did.
- 22 Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what's been marked
- 23 Defendant's Exhibit Number 2. It's in that large binder.
- 24 A. Okay. Okay, I'm there.
- 25 \parallel Q. And just let me know when you're there.

- 1 A. I'm there.
- 2 Q. Okay. And do you recognize that document?
- 3 A. Yes.
- $4 \parallel Q$. What is it?
- 5 A. It is the report that I prepared.
- 6 Q. Okay. And I'm going to ask you to take a look at -- it's
- 7 not numbered Pages 2 and 3, but just behind your cover sheet,
- 8 the documents reviewed.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Do you see where we are?
- 11 A. Yes, the documents reviewed sheet.
- 12 | Q. And I'm going to ask you to take a look at those two pages.
- 13 A. I'm there.
- 14 Q. Does that accurately depict the documents that you reviewed
- 15 during and in preparation for your investigation?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And then I'm going to ask you to take a look at the
- 18 | following page, which, again, is not numbered but would be Page
- 19 Number 4.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Persons interviewed.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And does that accurately depict the individuals you
- 24 interviewed --
- 25 A. It does.

- Q. -- as part of your investigation?
- 2 A. It does.

1

- MS. FREESE: Okay. Your Honor, at this point I would move for the admission of Defendant's Exhibit Number 2,
- 5 Ms. Luck's report.
 - THE COURT: Any objection to two, counsel?
- 7 MS. TAYLOR: No, Your Honor.
- 8 THE COURT: Exhibit 2 is admitted.
- 9 BY MS. FREESE:
- 10 Q. And, Ms. Luck, I would note, as you're familiar, this
- 11 social history report has been previously provided to the
- 12 | court, so what I'd like to do this morning is really just touch
- 13 on certain highlights in the chronology of William's life.
- 14 Okay?
- 15 A. That's fine.
- 16 Q. So I'm going to first ask you -- and because I'm not
- 17 | tendering you as an expert, not looking for opinions, just
- 18 simply your factual investigation. Okay?
- 19 A. Sure.
- 20 | Q. So I want to go all the way back, really, to William's
- 21 conception and the pregnancy and birth. Did you interview any
- 22 witnesses that were able to give you information relating to
- 23 this?
- 24 A. I did.
- 25 Q. Could you tell the court anything significant about that

portion of the investigation?

A. Well, I think probably one of the most significant ones was when I went to the home of Ruben Augusta in Brooklyn. I knocked on his door. He was suspected to be the potential father. And it was early in the morning. It was earlier than 8:00 a.m., and he was dressed and ready to go to work. He was working in the finance industry. And I told him what I was there for, and he said, I'm not a bit surprised that you came looking for me. And he was able to sit down and talk to me. He gave me about an hour of his time.

He explained that he was in a long-term relationship with William's mother, that they were college sweethearts, that they had intentions of being married, and there was a point in time within the relationship that she had come to him and told him that she was pregnant. And he was very happy about that, and they had put together a wedding date.

And during the pregnancy, there were suspicions that maybe she was involved with someone else. And it became confirmed later on that she had an affair with a Kenny Hunter. Simultaneously, when she was involved with Ruben Augusta, she had also been telling Kenny Hunter that he was the father of her child.

Now, his family had their own suspicions about the paternity and didn't believe it was Kenny's son. So it was a very, very traumatic time in their life. There were many, many

- arguments. The pregnancy was a very difficult one for her, and there was a lot of deception, a lot of secrets being told throughout. His --
 - Q. Now -- go ahead.

4

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

- A. His birth was also difficult. He had a seizure. He was on phenobarbital for a period of time, and he had a lot of muscular atrophy following his birth.
- Q. During the course of your investigation, did you actually receive a copy of a paternity test to show whether or not Ruben Augusta was the father?
 - A. Yes. He said, I have some very important papers that I want you to see. And I was down in his dining room, and he had gone upstairs in the bedroom. He had saved those papers all that time and brought them down to prove that he was not his father.

And it was very difficult because he was -- the baby was being brought around to his family being told it was his child up until about the time that William was about one and a half, two years old.

- Q. And were there any other witnesses that you interviewed,
 Ms. Luck, that specifically talked about any of the trauma or
 tumult surrounding the pregnancy and birth of Mr. Augusta?
- 23 A. Yeah, Robin Bell was speaking to that, too.
 - Q. And what, if anything, did she tell you?
 - A. The same type of thing, that it was a difficult pregnancy,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Direct/Freese - Luck

that there were questions regarding the paternity, and, you know, it was a very, very ugly time. There were a lot of fights within the relationship, with Ruben Augusta. Kenny was away for a period of time. He was in jail and in and out. Q. And I just want to interrupt you. When you say "Kenny," who are you referring to? A. Kenny Hunter, who was later shown to be the biological father. Q. Thank you for that clarification. Okay. Moving forward to what I would call sort of the early childhood years of Mr. Augusta, you know, what I would characterize maybe between the ages of five and eight, did you interview any witnesses that indicated there was any trauma or abuse to my client as a small child? A. Oh, much. Before Kenny came into the picture, his situation with his mother appeared, from what we hear, to be quite -- well, once Kenny comes into the house, he doesn't like the way that William is being babied. He calls him a faggot, that he should dress up -- put on a dress. He's demoralizing William constantly.

There's frequent, frequent domestic abuse within the house, domestic abuse in terms of Kenny against the mother, Kenny with the grandmother, the mother and Kenny fighting with each other. There were episodes that William would be dragged out of the house in the middle of the night while he and the

mother were fleeing to grocery stores and other places to hide from Kenny.

It was a horrible situation. He was frequently physically abused by Kenny. It was a nightmare of a situation growing up for him.

- Q. Was there any evidence that his mother physically abused ——
 let me just clarify, that William, my client, that his mother
 physically abused him?
- A. Yes. There was -- when Kenny -- Kenny is in and out of
 their lives, and when Kenny left the house, the mother more or
 less took on the persona of the father at that point and
 becomes very, very aggressive with him. And there are reports
 that she chases him down and beats him like a man, just
 horrible things.
 - Q. And did that come from a witness?
- 16 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

15

18

19

20

- 17 | Q. A witness told you that?
 - A. Yes, to the point where she offered, one of the witnesses actually offered to take him in because she was so upset about the way he was being treated within that home.
 - Q. And who specifically told you that?
- 22 A. I think that was Nichelle.
- Q. Did you learn through your review of records or your interviews of witnesses whether there were any suicide attempts by my client as a child?

- A. Yeah, there was a suicide attempt when he was approximately eight years old.
- Q. And did you review any hospitalization records that verify that?
- 5 A. Yes. He was hospitalized by the time he was ten years old.
 - Q. Do you recall where that was, Ms. Luck? If I said it was at the Meadows, does that sound correct?
 - A. Yes, yes, that's correct.
- 9 Q. Okay. Was there anything significant about that hospitalization or records you reviewed?
- 11 A. Yes, it was quite a frightening ordeal for him with that
 12 hospitalization. He was restrained during that -- imagine
 13 being a young child at approximately ten years old and being
 14 put into physical restraints. It was just horrible for him.
 15 Another incident when you were asking about abuse, if I can
- 16 just go back a little bit, would that be all right?
- 17 | Q. Sure.

24

25

6

7

8

A. Okay. The father was extremely physically abusive,
emotionally abusive. There was a situation that he was taken
out to eat and not allowed to have food. Everybody else in the
family was able to eat except for William. He was put down in
front of his siblings, in front of everybody, and they created
an atmosphere that he was the hated one within the family, and

he was treated differently. He was the family scapegoat.

There was a situation that he had gone into, I think

it was a McDonald's, and he wanted an adult meal instead of the kid's meal, and that's a few more dollars. And a lot of kids have big eyes and want to eat. He, in that case, did.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this time. I didn't hear Ms. Luck indicate who was giving this information, who is providing this information.

7 MS. FREESE: I'll be happy to clarify, Your Honor. 8 BY MS. FREESE:

- Q. Who told you specifically about this? You were just discussing a McDonald's incident. Who told you about that?
- 11 A. That was William.

4

5

6

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Okay. And what did he tell you?
 - A. He told me that on that particular episode, he had ordered that adult meal and it was too much for him to eat and his father forced him to eat that meal. And he got sick as a result of eating it, and he vomited, and his father made him eat the vomit.
 - Q. Okay. I'm going to sort of -- was there anything else about what I call the early childhood years or prepubescent years with respect to your investigation that was significant?
 - A. Yes, there was.
- Q. And what was that?
- A. He was a very, very isolated child. He didn't have any -
 MS. TAYLOR: Again, Your Honor, if Ms. Luck could

 indicate where that information is coming from.

THE WITNESS: We have that, I believe, even in the records from the Meadows. I think the mother had said that he hadn't had a friend the entire time. And then --

THE COURT: Can you just indicate whether you've drawn conclusions based on particular facts or are you reciting the facts as told to you?

THE WITNESS: I'm reciting as told.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And what the source of the facts are.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, and I think that was the report from the Meadows where the mother had indicated that he was isolated and had no friends.

- BY MS. FREESE:
- Q. Did any of the other witnesses that you interviewed touch on the subject, as well, whether for -- you interviewed some teachers. Is that correct?
- 17 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

24

- Q. Okay. Did anyone else offer any information about whether or not he was isolated as a child?
- A. He just started to make friends when he was about in high school.
- Q. Okay. Is that what your investigation revealed, the witnesses you interviewed?
 - A. Yes, yeah.
 - | Q. And so that's sort of where I want to go next, is what I

would call the early teen years, which, I mean, his teenage years is actually when the conduct that's the subject of these charges started.

But let's go back to maybe 11, 12, 13, okay, those early teen years. Did you talk to anyone, including, of course, Mr. Augusta, that gave you information about what happened during this time in his life?

- A. Yes. I interviewed a Janet Folson, a Marianne Krahulec, a

 Susan Fry, and a Cheryl Parsons.
- Q. And what, if anything, were you able to determine -- and you also talked to my client. Is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

22

23

24

- Q. And I should ask you this, clarify this, approximately how long did you spend with Mr. Augusta?
- 15 A. About six hours.
- Q. And during your conversation with him, did you elicit a social history from him?
- 18 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And that social history that you elicited from him, was that similar to the social history that you elicited when you were a probation or a parole officer?
 - A. No, we spent much shorter times. We would probably sit with our clients about an hour to an hour and a half, and we didn't have the luxury to be able to reach out and interview as many parties as we did. We usually based our social history on

what our client told us, and then we would send some releases out. If we got the information back, that was great, we included it. But we really went to great extents to try to

interview as many people as possible in this case.

Q. And did you do more than that here?

to them, but it was difficult for him.

6 A. Yes, yes, clearly.

years of William's life?

4

5

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. So back to these witnesses during what I'm calling the early, you know, teen years that you interviewed. What, if anything, was significant about your investigation into these
- 11 A. That he was just starting to make friends. He had got
 12 involved in some theater and music. He was -- he tried to be
 13 kind to the people that he met. He tried to be a good friend
 - He never wanted to be home. That was a consistent thing. The teachers would say that he wanted to stay and help out extra time and try to be away from home as much as possible. That was a consistent message.
 - Q. And did William report to you in your interview with him any conduct or anything significant about this time in his life?
 - A. Yeah. During this period of time, he starts entering the chat rooms, and the chat rooms become sexualized chat rooms.
 - Q. At about what age did he report that that conduct started?
 - A. He starts entering the chat room about age 12.

- Q. And did he tell you anything about the nature of those discussions or who he was talking with?
- 3 A. He did.

- Q. And what did he tell you?
- A. He was talking to other individuals, other men, and eventually, like, older men, and they had become sexualized.
- 7 Q. Okay. Did he ever indicate to you whether these were
- 8 | typing discussions? Did they involve instances where the older
- 9 men could see him or he was -- you know, sort of a Skype or
- 10 something similar to that?
- 11 A. It eventually went to physical contact with these
- 12 individuals.
- 13 | Q. Over the Internet?
- 14 A. Over the Internet that he met them.
- 15 Q. Did he ever report meeting up with any of these
- 16 | individuals?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And what did he report with respect to that?
- 19 A. That he would have sex with them and try to do what they
- 20 wanted him to do.
- 21 Q. And did he indicate the ages of any of these men?
- 22 A. That they were older, all different ages.
- 23 Q. What else about these teenage years or anything else with
- 24 respect to your investigation that may have been significant,
- 25 | highlights of your report? Well, let me direct you.

- 1 A. Okay.
- 2 Q. That's sort of a very broad question.
- 3 A. Yeah. Thank you.
- Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at Page 6 of your
- 5 report.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Okay. And I'm going to ask you to take a look, actually,
- 8 at the second full paragraph. It starts with the words,
- 9 Records from that hospitalization.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. So did you review any records that revealed that he
- 12 suffered from posttraumatic stress disorder?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 14 | Q. And what, if anything, did those records indicate?
- 15 \parallel A. That he also suffered from staring spells, that he had
- 16 I flashbacks. This was the time that he was ten years old, so
- 17 | that was a little bit earlier. The hospitalizations said he
- 18 | had PTS flashbacks for the last five years and had school
- 19 related anxiety. He was very isolated in school during those
- 20 early years.
- 21 Q. That was another question about the school records that you
- 22 reviewed. Did you -- was there any evidence of bullying or
- 23 anything like that with respect to his attendance at school?
- 24 A. Yes. He was bullied from early on. His demeanor was
- 25 different than the other -- he was very bright, but I think he

- had a little bit more maybe an effeminate demeanor. He was very isolated by other children.
 - Q. Did he report to you any specific instances of bullying, or did you review that in any counselor records?
 - A. Yes, he was bullied even early on from the first school he was at at age six. He was frequently hit by the other boys and forced to -- well, he had a sexual act with one of the boys at six years old.

MS. TAYLOR: Again, Your Honor, I would object to this testimony and ask that the witness indicate where this information is attributed to or whom she's attributing it to.

THE COURT: Okay. Could you back up and --

THE WITNESS: That particular -- the sexual aspect of it was through William. And I did make an attempt to interview -- I mean, I had a name of a young man, and I went to his home on two occasions and knocked on that door and made -- you know, put a note on the door to have him call me. I called the family house to try to interview the young man, but they didn't call back.

BY MS. FREESE:

- Q. And just so we're clear, when you say you attempted to interview the young man, what young man are you talking about?
- A. This boy that was bullying him in school and the one that sexually, you know, touched him when they were six years old.
 - Q. Okay. So when you interviewed William, did he provide you

1 | with a name?

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

A. Yes, he did.

called back.

- Q. And you attempted to run that down?
- A. Yes. And I did, I found out where they lived, and I went to the home twice. And then my office ended up even asking the father if the young man could please reach us, but he never

THE COURT: I just want to clarify, the sexual involvement with the other six-year-old, was it reported to you as being nonconsensual?

THE WITNESS: No, it wasn't reported as nonconsensual, but it was a situation with a boy that didn't like him, that was actually beating him up in school and bothering him. There were two twin brothers, and it was the one brother that was the one that did this with him. And I did go to their house on two occasions.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

- BY MS. FREESE:
- Q. Ms. Luck, I think that concludes my specific questions, but
 I just want to summarize it by indicating, is everything in
 your report an accurate account of your investigation in this
- 23 A. Yes.

matter?

Q. Is there anything about the investigation that was significant that you did not include within your report?

Α. No. 1 2 3 for Ms. Luck. 4 THE COURT: For the government. 5 6 the statements of Ms. Luck pursuant to 26.2. 7 THE COURT: What statements are there? 8 9 any statements that would be contained in the email communications. 10 11 12 1.3 14 15 16 17 grammatical changes. 18 19 20 21 22 logistics of her travel here and retention. 23 24

25

MS. FREESE: Your Honor, that concludes my questions MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, at this time I would request MS. TAYLOR: Specifically what I'm referring to are MS. FREESE: Your Honor, to the best of -- I mean, my collection last night, and I did attempt to review them when I was saving them, they are discussions between the two of us about her invoices, receipts being paid, traveling here to testify. There was, in this case, a draft report that was prepared by Ms. Luck. It was not a final report. There were There is one communication where, you know, we don't discuss the substance of that, I simply indicate to her I would like it to be easier to read, and so she redoes the report, adds some grammatical changes, and sends it back to me. is, what I would say, a summary, setting up phone conferences, THE COURT: All right. Ms. Taylor, which of these are you seeking to use in your cross-examination?

MS. TAYLOR: Well, Your Honor, I haven't had a chance to review any of them. You know, if Ms. Freese would like the court to review them briefly in camera to see if any of them are privileged. I'd like an opportunity to review any of them that are relevant to Ms. Luck's -- relevant to this case and that fall under 26.2 before we proceed with her cross-examination. So any that aren't privileged, I'd like an opportunity to review briefly.

MS. FREESE: I believe they're all privileged. She's my agent, I retained her. She's open to cross, she's available, she prepared a comprehensive report. They were prepared in preparation for litigation. I think that all of my communications are an extension of the attorney-client relationship.

She's here. Certainly her compensation, all of those things are fair game. Her detailed invoices, Your Honor, I would argue, are privileged in the sense that they also reference other cases she worked on. Some of the receipts indicate other people who have retained her services.

So if the court believes that they -- I'm invoking the work product privilege, and if the court orders, as I've indicated, I certainly have -- everything I could attempt to collect within 18 hours is here.

And there are, by the way, I should indicate to the court, there are not hundreds of emails. Our email

communication was actually quite limited. I usually 1 corresponded with her assistant. 2 3 THE COURT: All right. MS. TAYLOR: Well, Your Honor, we're not interested in 4 the invoices or in any of Ms. Luck's other clients, obviously, 5 6 but certainly anything that has to do with draft reports or 7 anything that appears to be substantive as to Mr. Augusta's case and involving Ms. Luck fits within 26.2. 8 9 THE COURT: All right, counsel. Let me have -- do you have them separated by Dr. Krueger and Ms. Luck? 10 MS. FREESE: I believe so. I asked our computer 11 12 systems administrator this morning to do just that. THE COURT: All right. Would it be obvious to me if I 13 14 opened the device that you're supplying or will I need your 15 assistance to review them and determine which of these you claim to be privileged? 16 17 MS. FREESE: It may be helpful, Your Honor, if I get it started to expedite the process. But I haven't actually 18 viewed it because of the time constraints. My CSA did it early 19 20 this morning. So I believe -- I asked him to separate it into 21 folders, but I haven't actually viewed this flash drive. 22 THE COURT: How long do we have your witnesses? 23 MS. FREESE: Today. 24 Just today. It might make sense to hear THE COURT: 25 from Dr. Krueger and then come back to this witness.

```
MS. FREESE: For cross-examination?
1
2
              THE COURT: Yes, yes.
3
              MR. BERRY: So just to be clear, Your Honor, after
     Dr. Krueger's testimony, we'll make the same motion. I guess
4
     at that time is when Your Honor will review --
5
 6
              THE COURT: Yes.
7
              MR. BERRY: -- both sets of emails, and then we'll
     come back and do seriatim the crosses?
8
9
              THE COURT: Yes.
10
              MR. BERRY: Okay. Thank you.
              THE COURT: Would you step down, please.
11
12
              THE WITNESS: Sure.
              MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I've asked Ms. Luck to step
13
14
     out --
15
              THE COURT: Yes.
              MS. FREESE: -- while Dr. Krueger testifies, as well.
16
17
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Come forward, if you
     would, please. Good morning, Doctor.
18
19
              DR. KRUEGER: Good morning.
         RICHARD KRUEGER, M.D., called as a witness, having been
20
21
     duly sworn or affirmed, testified as follows:
22
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: For the record, please state your
     full name.
23
24
              THE WITNESS: Richard Bohn Krueger.
25
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: Could you spell your last name,
```

please. 1 2 THE WITNESS: K-r-u-e-g-e-r. COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. 3 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. FREESE: 5 6 Good morning, Dr. Krueger. 7 Good morning. Α. Dr. Krueger, if you could, could you please tell the court 8 9 about your formal education? I went to undergraduate college at a place called 10 Albion College in Southern Michigan. I went to medical school, 11 12 graduated from Harvard Medical School in 1977. I had training in internal medicine at the Boston VA Hospital from '77 to '80, 1.3 1980, and became board certified in medicine in 1981, 1980 to 14 15 1981. I did a psychiatry residency at Boston University and 16 17 became board certified -- from 1980 to 1983 and became board 18 certified in psychiatry in 1984. I subsequently have had experience and been board certified in forensic psychiatry and 19 20 addiction psychiatry for ten-year periods on three occasions. 21 I just passed my boards in 2016 again for ten years. 22 Q. Okay. So what are the current certifications that you hold? 23 24 Well, I'm board certified in psychiatry, board certified in 25 internal medicine, board certified in addiction psychiatry, and

- 1 board certified in forensic psychiatry.
 - Q. And where are you currently employed?
- 3 A. I am self-employed. I'm also employed four days per week
- 4 by the New York State Psychiatric Institute, which is a state
- 5 psychiatric research hospital in Manhattan.
- 6 Q. Okay. And do you also do work with the Sexual Behavior
- 7 Clinic?

- 8 A. Yes. My job title -- well, actually, I'm a Clinical
- 9 Specialist II on the sort of payroll, but my function is to be
- 10 | medical director of the Sexual Behavior Clinic, which is a
- 11 clinic which has existed for some 30 years at New York State
- 12 | Psychiatric Institute, which offers a program of treatment to
- 13 | juveniles who committed sexual offenses.
- Part of the clinic's responsibility and my
- 15 | responsibility is to advise the various individuals in the New
- 16 York State Office of Mental Health on the evaluation, risk
- 17 assessment, and treatment of sexual offenders within the Office
- 18 of Mental Health System, which I've done for 20-plus years.
- 19 Q. Okay. And during the course of your experience, have you
- 20 specifically conducted sex offender evaluations?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Approximately how many, ballpark?
- 23 A. I would say, ballpark, a thousand.
- 24 | Q. And what about mental health evaluations, have you
- 25 conducted them?

- 1 A. Ballpark, about 5,000 in my career overall.
- 2 Q. And have you published peer-reviewed articles?
 - A. Yes.

- 4 Q. And are they detailed in your CV?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. I'm actually going to -- well, let me just ask you this,
- 7 how about case reports or any chapters in books, are you
- 8 published in any of these areas?
- 9 A. There are a number of chapters. I think there are some
- 10 case reports. There are a fair number of peer-reviewed
- 11 articles. These are all detailed in my CV.
- 12 | Q. And I'm going to ask you to take a look at that large
- 13 | binder that's up in front of you.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. If you go to Tab 3.
- 16 A. Okay.
- 17 Q. And are you there?
- 18 **||** A. Yes, I am.
- 19 Q. Do you recognize that document?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And what is that?
- 22 A. It's my CV as of May 3rd, 2017.
- 23 MS. FREESE: Okay. Your Honor, at this point -- well,
- I would first move for the admission of his CV, which I have
- 25 marked as Defendant's Exhibit Number 3, but the government has

- 1 just indicated that they have no objection at this point to me
- 2 tendering Dr. Krueger as an expert. And we would be offering
- 3 | him, Your Honor, in the area of an expert of forensic
- 4 psychiatry and sex offender evaluation.
- 5 THE COURT: He'll be so qualified.
- 6 BY MS. FREESE:
- 7 Q. Now, moving along, you were retained by the Federal Public
- 8 Defender's Office to conduct an evaluation in this case. Is
- 9 | that correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Okay. And did you, in fact, conduct an evaluation --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- of Mr. Augusta?
- 14 | A. I did.
- 15 Q. And did you meet with him?
- 16 | A. I did.
- 17 Q. And approximately how long did you spend with him?
- 18 A. I think for about four or five hours.
- 19 Q. Okay. And did you review a number of other documents as
- 20 part of your analysis and evaluation in this matter?
- 21 A. I did.
- 22 | Q. And I'm going to ask you to then just turn to Number 4 in
- 23 that large binder.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. And that's thick, but I'm going to ask you to look through

- that, to page through that. The first portion, is that a copy of your report?
 - A. Yes. Under four, it's a copy of my report, yes.
 - Q. And that's a report you prepared in this matter?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. And behind that then would be some of the raw scoring data that you provided to my office as part of your evaluation. Is that correct?
 - A. Well, under Item Number 6, there is a copy of the basic testing that I did.
 - MS. FREESE: Okay. Your Honor, at this point I'm going to offer the report prepared by Dr. Krueger, which was also appended to our sentencing memorandum, into evidence at this time.
 - THE COURT: That would be Exhibit 4?
 - MS. FREESE: That's correct, Your Honor.
 - MR. BERRY: And just to be clear, Your Honor, are we admitting the 16-page document only, or are we admitting the 16-page document along with what appears to be, I don't know, an inch thick of pages of the SCID, the S-C-I-D, that says, Tests, slash, Risk Assessment Instruments, which is still behind Tab 4, and an even thicker stack which is what the doctor just identified as the actual risk assessment instruments, diagnostic instruments that he utilized under Tab 6? It's unclear to me what we're offering.

MS. FREESE: And, Your Honor, my apologies, I'm only offering the report itself into evidence.

THE COURT: So that would be the 16 pages?

MR. BERRY: The 16 pages?

MS. FREESE: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERRY: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Exhibit 4 is admitted.

BY MS. FREESE:

- Q. Okay. So the court has, as you know, had the benefit of reviewing the report, your report. I'm going to ask you to
- 12 turn to Page 2 of your 16-page report.
- 13 A. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. And that details, as of the date that you prepared this report, some documents that you reviewed. Is that right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, since that time, you've also reviewed the presentence report that was prepared by the probation officer
- 19 in this matter. Right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And you prepared the sentencing memoranda filed by both parties. Is that right?
- 23 A. I reviewed the sentencing memoranda, yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, I'm not going to ask you to recount the social
- 25 | history because, well, Ms. Luck testified, and, again, the

court has reviewed the report.

But what I am going to ask you to do, Dr. Krueger, is to identify any significant factors about his prior social history with respect to your evaluation. Was there anything about his social history that was significant to you in reaching your conclusions?

A. Well, I would say there's a lot. I think in the first instance, he was a product of a — this is not quite a social history, but appropriate medical history, he was a product of this complicated pregnancy. He had, I think, some significant brain issues, seizure disorder and so on, yet he emerged from this with an IQ of 124. That's overall quite a remarkable occurrence.

He was subjected to very significant physical abuse on the part of both his mother and his father, which I think Louise Luck documented. I think he had a -- there were a lot of moves. He had a very unstable childhood going from place to place. It sounds like he was not supervised as well as he might have been.

He continued in school and graduated from school, which I think is quite remarkable given the overall circumstances, and appeared to have some interest and aptitude in the arts.

And he was quite an unhappy child. He was somewhat effeminate. He was very bullied. At one point early on he

- 1 attempted suicide. He had a brief psychiatric hospitalization.
- 2 And I think those would be the main, main characteristics.
- Q. Was there anything that you reviewed to indicate that he
- 4 had any prior sex offender treatment of any type?
- 5 A. He had had -- there was nothing I reviewed to suggest that.
- 6 It appeared that he did not.
- 7 Q. Okay. And was there any evidence of what I'm going to call
- 8 prior imposition of a legal sanction or any prior criminal
- 9 convictions?
- 10 A. This was his first -- these two arrests, the state arrests
- 11 | and then the federal arrests were the two arrests. I think
- 12 he -- when I spoke with him, he characterized when he was a
- 13 | juvenile that he had somehow been arrested for purportedly
- 14 assaulting his grandmother, but I discussed, and there's no
- 15 | legal record of this, there's no evidence of conviction, so
- 16 this could have been his misunderstanding.
- 17 | Q. Well, let me ask you about the -- whether or not that's a
- 18 significant fact. Is prior imposition of a legal sanction, as
- 19 part of your analysis, a significant fact or not?
- 20 A. Yes, it would be.
- 21 | Q. Why?
- 22 A. Because generally associated with the risk of recidivism
- 23 would be, first of all, the imposition of a legal sanction. If
- 24 somebody has been arrested as a juvenile or as an adult, this
- 25 would create a history that would suggest that somebody is

antisocial. That's one element.

The second element is if they have been arrested and sanctioned, this would then impose some deterrence on them.

And the question in assessing sexual offenders is -- really any offender is whether they respond to this imposition of a legal sanction. And if one has been imposed and they don't respond to it, this tells you a lot.

In this case, there was no prior legal sanction, so this is basically a first arrest. The fact that there were no prior legal sanctions which he then went on to violate is, I think, notable.

- Q. And I want to touch upon a sexual history, his self-report and, of course, the records that you reviewed. Did you ask him about prior sexual abuse?
- A. I did.

- Q. And what was his response?
- A. He said that he had not been sexually abused. I regularly ask this as part of my assessment of sexual functioning. I then within the information provided, it was evident that he he gave a history of having engaged in sexually related chatting, cybersexual interactions from 12 or 13 onwards with adults, not with peers but with adults. This would certainly be considered sexual abuse.

I was kind of struck that there was no history of, you know, sexual abuse mentioned in the records or anything I could

find. I actually sort of discussed this with Louise Luck a little bit. I was kind of surprised.

But in my view, this would constitute sexual abuse, the interaction of himself as a minor with adults over the Internet in a cybersexual way. This would be considered sexual abuse. Louise Luck agreed.

- Q. But he didn't report it as that?
- A. That's correct.

- Q. So what I'd like to do next is really move to and highlight some of the testing that you did, talk about its significance.

 So let me first start with, Dr. Krueger, how do you determine,
- 12 | in a case like this, which tests to administer?
 - A. Well, generally I involve a series that I use regularly to assess sexual offenders, which is basically the series that was applied here. I think that within, say, forensic psychiatry, individuals or the assessment of sexual offenders, individuals, experts are free to develop and use their own sort of package of instruments.

You want to use, as much as possible, agreed-upon standard instruments, from a psychiatric point of view agreed-upon and validated psychiatric instruments. And this is the sort of final composition of what I use. So these are -- this basically presents in order the package that I usually use, and I have used it for many years. It has been pretty stable for many years.

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

Q. Okay. And I just -- you've already been qualified as an expert, but I think this is relevant to your credibility. Have you, you know, received training and actually traveled the world on this topic?

A. Yes, I would say -- so the diagnostic manual that's used to assess, to determine psychiatric disorders is called the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual published by the American Psychiatric Association. And the New York State Psychiatric Institute and Columbia have had a large role in this going forward. And the most recent edition was Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, Fifth Edition, DSM-5.

And I was involved for five years in the writing and revision of the sexual disorders and the paraphilic disorders chapter of that manual. Actually, my areas of specialty were sexual masochism, sexual sadism, and paraphilic coercive disorder, and I published in articles regarding at least the former.

Subsequent to that, I was invited to revise, help revise the classification manual which is used by most of the world called the International Classification of Disease. So the current manual is ICD-10, International Classification of Disease, Tenth Edition.

So for the past six years I've been involved in revision of the paraphilic disorders -- the whole sexual disorders chapter and the paraphilic disorders chapter of

- 1 ICD-10. We've published our recommendations. I'm sort of the
- 2 | lead author on the publication in terms of revision of this
- 3 chapter from ICD-10 to ICD-11.
- 4 Q. So before we get to -- thank you for that explanation.
- 5 Before we get to the specific highlights of some of the tests,
- 6 as part of the materials, did you review a report that was
- 7 prepared by a Dr. Timothy Foley?
- 8 A. I did.
- 9 Q. And that was a report that I provided to you. Is that
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 | Q. Okay. And that was an evaluation of my client, William
- 13 Augusta. Right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. All right. Now, one of the screens, one of the tests you
- 16 did not do is something known as the Abel screen.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And I would like -- I'm curious, why did you not perform
- 19 | that test?
- 20 A. Well, actually, Dr. Abel had started our Sexual Behavior
- 21 Clinic 35 years ago and then moved to Atlanta to develop this
- 22 assessment instrument. I think that -- it uses something
- 23 called viewing time. It presents a whole large series of
- 24 questions.
- 25 It also relies on something called viewing time in

which -- the idea is to, in some fashion -- similar to treating drug abusers or assessing drug abusers, you want to find some objective instrument that beyond their self-report will allow you to assess what their true sexual interest is.

The tradition or the best study instrument is penile plethysmography in the field where you have somebody attach a device to their penis and present stimuli and see how much arousal they have. This is refined in Canada. There are large issues of it in the U.S. and generally.

A sort of -- Dr. Abel tried this. He developed as a -- sort of a more succinct way of doing this something called viewing time in which he would present images of various categories, adults, children, and so on, to someone for them to rate and try and assess their degree of sexual interest.

He promulgated this. There have been only a couple of articles that really have -- that he's produced that have independently validated this. But within the field, I think there's a lot of concern that this is -- there's not adequate validation. We did this in the past. We don't do it any longer just because of the lack of substantial validation of it.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. So let's move, if we could, to Page 9 of your report. And this is where you really summarize some of the tests that you administered in this case.
- A. Yes.

- Q. So the first test I want to review with you is what you referred to as the sexual SCID?
- 3 A. Yes.
 - Q. S-C-I-D?
- 5 A. Yes.

- Q. What is it about your administration of this test that's significant in this case, if anything?
 - A. Well, I would say sexual SCID stands for the Structured Clinical Interview for Diagnoses. Again, this is a methodology that was developed at Columbia and Psychiatric Institute and applied to a number of other psychiatric disorders, depression, mania, and so on.

And basically the case that -- it can become -there's unreliability in terms of making psychiatric diagnoses,
and the SCID was a structured way of leading trained clinicians
to achieve diagnoses. And using these written instruments, one
is able to achieve a much higher rate of test/retest
reliability, of interrater reliability, of validity. This is
with the various other disorders.

Now, in the field of sexual disorders, there are -when I sort of wrote this SCID, there were five or six other
SCIDs that had been used in various studies, some of which were
reported in the American Journal of Psychiatry and otherwise.

But there's an issue in terms of the validation of this instrument, that it has not been broadly validated, but

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

there is no such instrument to achieve a diagnosis of deviant sexual interest that has been validated.

In any event, this is a structured way of making a psychiatric diagnosis, and I have used this for ten years or more. And using this, Mr. -- so it would rely on an interview of the individual, but also all other available information. Typically one would use a criminal record. If there is Internet material, you would use that, collateral historians, victim statements, whatever information is out there.

Using this, I made a diagnosis of pedophilia, even though Mr. Augusta denied that he was sexually aroused by his brother. He made a criteria for sexual masochism. This was actually his preferred manner of sexual arousal. He also made a criteria for sexual sadism and for something called a sexual disorder not otherwise specified or hypersexual disorder characterized by compulsive masturbation, sex with others, pornography dependence, and cybersexual interactions.

This whole notion of sort of a hypersexual disorder, a compulsive sexual behavior disorder is something new. It's something that we recommended for inclusion in the DSM-5, which was not. But this is recognized more and more, and it will, for instance, be part of the ICD-11. But it would generally reflect that Mr. Augusta has been hypersexual, extremely sexual from his juvenile years onward, basically.

Q. The next test of note is, which you list is the Bancroft

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

Self-Report Scale of Sexual Interest and Activity. Why did you administer that test?

A. Again, this is just a ballpark way of characterizing somebody's degree of sexual arousal or of sexual drive. This was a -- again, within the field, there are not good, well-validated instruments for the use of assessing sexual drive.

The Bancroft I would say was used in a modified version in an article which is published in the New England Journal of Medicine. Dr. Bancroft developed this 50 years ago for some inpatient studies. It basically asks an individual on a line or on a Likert Scale, on a scale from zero to five, how much they've been interested in sex in the past week and how many ejaculations they've had.

And I would do this for current -- for the week prior to the interview, and then just to get some idea of how somebody had been prior to their sort of incarceration or the imposition of a legal offense, I would ask for the same scores in an earlier time period.

This indicated Mr. Augusta said he was quite interested in sex, four out of five for both time periods, but that he had an average of fourteen ejaculations per week prior to his incarceration and three ejaculations per week before I interviewed him.

So, again, this would -- I mean, lots of individuals

might want to sort of deceive and just sort of say they're not sexually interested at all. This was -- you know, this suggested that he was being forthright. It also suggested broadly that his hypersexuality had decreased with his incarceration, which is what you see.

- Q. I was going to say, is that typical?
- A. Yes, very typical.

- Q. The next sort of significant, and I know we're going to jump over some of these, but is the Clinical Global Impression Scale which you had detailed on Page 10. Why did you administer this test?
 - A. Well, again, if you're looking at psychiatric disorders, they're quite complex. It becomes very hard to sort of rate them and rate their degree of severity. The Clinical Global Impression Scale acknowledged this. It was developed 50 or 60 years ago at the National Institute of Mental Health.

And it basically asks a clinician who has some familiarity with the diagnosis in question in a particular area, how ill is this individual from one, not ill at all, to seven, among the most extremely ill patients that I've evaluated. And in this case, I gave Mr. Augusta a five, indicating that he was markedly ill. He was not among the most ill that I've evaluated, but he was markedly ill.

Q. And you indicate specifically that your focus there, if you go one, two, three, four, the fourth line from the bottom of

- Paragraph 3, that in this case, the focus of your estimation 2 involved the sexual and paraphilic disorders. Is that right?
- Yes, that's correct. 3 Α.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

subjective.

- How about the Abel and Becker Cardsort, why did you 4 administer that test? 5
- 6 A. Again, this is something that was developed by Dr. Abel at 7 the clinic. Basically, again, it's a quite subjective instrument. But you would -- it used to be that you would give 8 9 individuals cards with various scenarios and they would sort them, but this has just developed into a questionnaire. And 10 Mr. Augusta endorsed -- it's, again, an attempt to get somebody 11 to reveal what their sexual interest is. It's obviously quite 12

But he reported an interest in sexual activity with males, adult males, females, transvestic fetishism, dressing up in clothes of the opposite sex, voyeurism, and masochism. is consistent with the history that I obtained from him.

- Q. And jumping down now to Number 7 on Page 10, the next test that I'd like you to highlight is, and I will probably mispronounce this, but is it the Derogatis?
- Α. It's the Derogatis, yes.
- Derogatis Interview for Sexual Function. Why was this Q. significant, or why did you administer this test?
- 24 Well, again, there's a dearth, a lack of validated 25 instruments, but this was developed by Leonard Derogatis for

assessment of male sexual functioning. It gives you generally a ballpark idea of how somebody's sexual functioning is over the past month and compares this with norms which are within the grading pages of the instrument.

Mr. Augusta was in the fourth percentile, very low percentile in terms of sexual functioning, which, again, is what you would expect with somebody who is incarcerated. They just shut down. Some shut down, some don't.

- Q. In your experience -- and we've just sort of covered this.

 You said some shut down, some don't. In your experience,

 Doctor, do you typically see a shutdown?
- A. Yes, yes.

- Q. And the next test would be the Coleman Compulsive Sexual Behavior Inventory. If you could, please, highlight for the court why you administered that test and if there was anything significant about Mr. Augusta's results.
- A. Again, this is a test that was developed by Eli Coleman and others at the University of Minnesota just to establish how much how compulsive somebody's sexual behavior was and how much control they would have over their sexual behavior.

This indicated that he was -- that Mr. Augusta was quite compulsive when he engaged in this. This was the first point prior to his arrest. And compared with how he is -- how he was at the time I evaluated him, things had become much less compulsive. He was much less involved in compulsive -- he

- 1 assessed his behavior as being much less compulsive.
- 2 | Q. And what --

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Meaning his degree of control had increased. I think that would be the better way to report this.
- Q. And in your experience, what, if any, impact does incarceration typically have on them?
- A. Again, it would sort of settle individuals down. They would become -- they stop doing whatever they're doing, in large part.
- Q. The next test that I'd like to review is the Pathological/Problematic Sexual Behavior Scale.
 - A. This is, again, something called the YBOCS, Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale, which presents various scenarios and which has been extended to other -- it was developed for obsessive compulsive disorder, but it has extended to many other disorders, body dysmorphic disorder, pathological gambling.

In this case, it has been applied to sexual behavior, and it gives some sense of how much an individual is involved with compulsive sexual behavior. In his case, he got a score of -- zero is sort of no involvement. He got a score of 24 prior to his arrest and zero now, meaning that he, again, was not engaged in compulsive sexual behavior.

Q. Is that the type of result that you'd expect to see from someone incarcerated?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. And the final test under this portion of your report with respect to deviant sexual behavior was the Kinsey Scale.

A. Again, one would not assert that homosexuality is associated with or heterosexuality are associated with any particular increased risk of sexual -- of criminal sexual behavior, but this gives a ballpark idea of what somebody's sexual orientation is. And he indicated -- he circled a five out of six, six being exclusively homosexual. He was pretty

Q. There are three tests with respect to the screenings you conducted on psychiatric syndromes that I'd like to highlight.

Obviously all are included within your report.

much in that direction, but he had some interest in females.

The first test that I'd like you to touch on for the judge is the SCID or the SCID-I which you administered. Could you first explain why you administered the test and the significance of the results, if any?

A. Well, again, this is sort of the -- kind of original Structured Clinical Interview for Diagnoses. And I administer this pretty much in all the evaluations just to establish if there are any nonsexual psychiatric disorders that are -- that this individual has experienced.

And in this case, he -- this resulted in a diagnosis of Bipolar I disorder, which is where somebody has recurrent depression and hypomanic episodes and posttraumatic stress

disorder, chronic, severe.

- Q. And moving down to what's detailed as Number 13, my first question is, why do you -- what is the significance of alcohol abuse or evidence of alcohol abuse during the course of your evaluations?
- A. Well, just substance use is such a common component to criminal behavior that I regularly assess for drug abuse and alcohol abuse just clinically and with these -- with a couple of screening instruments.

In this case, the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test, the MAST, he got a score of zero, suggesting that he -- being consistent with the history that he did not have alcohol abuse problems or a disorder.

- Q. And the final test, again, in this category that I'd like to spend some time on is the Adverse Childhood Experiences scale. First, if you could explain to the court why you administered the test in this instance, and then I would like to talk to you a little bit about your results. So, first, why did you administer this test here?
- A. Well, again, it's part of a -- kind of general of the sort of list of instruments, instruments that I use in sort of a general psychiatric assessment. It gives a broad ballpark but very substantive way of assessing how adverse somebody's childhood experience has been. This is really quite a well-validated test which I've used for many years.

A high score is ten, a score of five is -- or six, I think he had, is -- suggests a very significant childhood adversity.

- Q. Now, in your report on Page 12, you indicate that this score of six is what you called extremely elevated and, in fact, the worst you've encountered in your experience.
- A. Yes.

- Q. Explain that. In other words, you've done thousands of evaluations, so explain the significance of that.
- 10 A. I've been using this probably for the past three or four years.
- 12 Q. Okay.
 - A. So a hundred couple, maybe a hundred evaluations, a hundred plus. And it basically gives, presents ten questions to an individual which they answer, you know, were you sexually abused, were you physically abused, was a parent lost to you by incarceration, questions such as that.

And this was a high score, an elevated score. I actually -- I subsequently have done an evaluation where somebody had a score of seven, so this is no longer the most -- the worst that I've seen.

- Q. Okay. Now, you reviewed the government's sentencing memorandum in this case. Is that right?
- 24 A. Yes.
 - Q. And in it you saw that the government spent some time

- discussing this ACE scale in reference to the victim, one of the victims in this case. Is that correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. And that specifically was something that we discussed this
- 5 morning. Is that correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Okay. One of the assertions in the government's memorandum
- 8 is that Mr. Augusta's crimes will most certainly shorten the
- 9 life span of the victim based upon, at least in part, this test
- 10 and the child's adverse experiences. Did you review that
- 11 portion of the memorandum?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And you didn't evaluate Victim Number 1 in this case, did
- 14 you?
- 15 A. That's correct, yes.
- 16 Q. You didn't evaluate any victims in this?
- 17 A. No. We don't usually do this in the course of such
- 18 evaluations.
- 19 Q. Right. I mean, you were retained for the purpose of
- 20 conducting an evaluation of Mr. Augusta. Correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. What, if any, opinion do you have with respect to the
- 23 application of these factors to Victim Number 1 to the extent
- 24 | that the government argues my client's conduct has shortened
- 25 the life span of Victim 1?

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

A. Well, I actually -- I'm not -- if I could be permitted, I just -- I have a copy of the test that I applied here, and I just want to see -- one question which emerges is, does one have to be an adult or of a certain age for this to be administered, and I'm not sure that's the case.

In any event, I sort of went through this. I mean, clearly Mr. Augusta's behavior towards Victim Number 1 could result in a score of two or three on this instrument, or two or three items. But overall, I think that -- I mean, this is basically a -- these are statistical matters, and I think that to draw a one-to-one correlation between a particular score and to say, to assert that it's going to decrease somebody's life by X amount I think is improper.

I would say that it would increase the risk of early -- the risk of early, earlier death of various physical or other diseases by a certain amount. The other element is that there are other matters in the environment of Victim Number 1 that would also contribute to whatever score this individual may have had.

Q. So is it -- and correct me if I'm wrong, I mean, are you able to score Victim Number 1 without actually evaluating him?

A. Sure, I believe one could. I guess the main question in my mind is, is there a minimum age at which point this has to be applied, can it be applied to kids that young.

I mean, it's sort of -- I think there are questions

- with prior to 18 and so on, which this may not be developed for individuals of such a minor age. I'm not that familiar with
- 3 the instrument to be able to answer that.
- 4 Q. Okay. And next I'd like to focus on the risk assessment
- 5 portion of your evaluation and the instruments you use. One of
- 6 the risk assessment instruments was the Static-99R. Is that
- 7 | right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. Why did you select this instrument? Why did you
- 10 administer this test in this instance?
- 11 A. Because it's the most validated, well-studied test,
- 12 | actuarial instrument for assessing the risk of reoffense. It
- 13 was developed in Canada. It's been used widely in many
- 14 | countries. There's large literature in many countries that
- 15 | support its validity. So this is the one, one main instrument
- 16 | that I use.
- 17 | Q. Okay. And what, if anything, was significant about
- 18 Mr. Augusta's results?
- 19 A. Well, so there's this -- you can get a scale of minus three
- 20 to plus twelve, and he had a score of four. Now, this puts him
- 21 in a moderate, moderate high risk category. I think there's a
- 22 new sort of set of scoring that a four may be in an above
- 23 average risk category or even a high risk category.
- 24 Q. And is that now, Dr. Krueger?
- 25 A. This would be now, if he were released into the community

- 1 now.
- 2 | Q. Okay.
- 3 A. On the other hand, given that he's going to be incarcerated
- 4 for, I'm not sure, a minimum of 30 years or 45 years -- crime
- 5 is a young man's game, basically, and the older somebody is,
- 6 the less risk they present of sexual recidivism.
- 7 So if he were to age out, I computed a score, a
- 8 reduction of his score from four to two, which would put him in
- 9 | a -- still in a low moderate, a low moderate or only average
- 10 category of risk.
- 11 \blacksquare Q. And that would be if released after 30 years?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Okay. Now, you're aware that he's actually serving a
- 14 | 45-year sentence for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 15 | Correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. So I'm going to ask you the same question. What if he were
- 18 | released in 45 years, what would that do to his score, if
- 19 anything?
- 20 A. This would reduce it even more. I mean, I think there's
- 21 sort of a threshold. If somebody is at least 60 or 65, maybe
- 22 | 60, they get a big decrement, according to the construction of
- 23 the instrument. So instead of minus one point, you get minus
- 24 three points. This would substantially reduce his risk.
- 25 Q. Now, in the government's sentencing memorandum, they

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

indicate that there's powerful evidence -- that's actually a direct quote from Page 38 -- indicating that recidivism rates for sex offenders do not appreciably decline as offenders age.

A. This is flat out wrong. I mean, it's just -- there's vast literature that very much supports that the older -- that the older somebody is, the less likely they are to recidivate, both with respect to sexual crimes and nonsexual crimes.

THE COURT: Doctor, can I interrupt you there and ask you whether there is a difference in contact offenders and pornographers with these rates of recidivism?

THE WITNESS: This has been in much dispute. There is a new instrument that's developed by Michael Seto that looks at the risk for Internet offenders. I'm just blacking on the name. I'll think of it.

In any event, Mr. Augusta is clearly a contact offender, and I think this would sort of drown out or reduce the sort of consideration of the risk associated with child pornography. He's a contact offender. You would treat him basically as a contact offender.

If he were solely an Internet offender, there's a large literature, there's been a lot of debate -- actually, the instrument Michael Seto had developed, who is the world's authority, I would say, on pedophilia in Canada at the University of Ottawa, is called the CPORT, and this is coming into use.

He would -- Mr. Augusta would have a high score on the CPORT in any event. He definitely would be considered a contact offender.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I would say that the fact that he is a contact offender makes very legitimate the use of these other instruments which were developed and based upon contact -- assessments of contact offenders.

BY MS. FREESE:

- Q. And, you know, based on, actually, the court's question, I do have a followup sort of question. In your community of psychiatry and among the scholars, has there been discussion of the Adam Walsh Act in the field itself?
- A. Yes, I would say some. I mean, I think that there are some misunderstandings within -- I can't quote with great detail, but there is -- for instance, within the Adam Walsh Act, there are penalties for this sort of crime, contact, noncontact. There may be penalties regarding number of victims.

And both of these variables, for instance, have not been proven to be validated risk factors in terms of predicting risk of reoffense. And I think there's great, within the professional community, skepticism about many of the -- much of the construction of the Adam Walsh Act.

Q. The next sort of focus on the risk assessment instruments is the Sexual Violence Risk-20. Why did you administer this

test on Mr. Augusta?

A. Well, again, this becomes an organized way of thinking of doing a risk assessment. This pushes an assessor to look for a number of factors which may be -- which should be considered in developing and assessing risk and treatment planning.

In this case, Mr. Augusta had a large number of factors. You can get a high of 20 factors. I would put zero to five as sort of a lower risk category, six to ten as a moderate risk. I rated him as having ten of -- say above ten, ten to fifteen is moderate, and above fifteen is high. This is my general gestalt in terms of assessing risk. He has a high number of factors.

- Q. And with respect to these high number of factors, again, is there any age correlation? In other words, with respect to in 45 years or 30 years with the same test, would you expect to see any results or is it simply unknown?
- A. I would just have to take a look at the instrument, if I may. Let's just see. The order is not quite the order that I had organized these in. Well, my best guess would be that there's -- bear with me, please.

MS. FREESE: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MS. FREESE:

Q. The government actually handed over a particular -- I'm going to ask you to take a look at the SVR-20 coding sheet. Is

- 1 this -- you found it.
- 2 A. I have this. So, I mean, he would -- many of these factors
- 3 are basically static factors, so I don't really think that
- 4 they're going to be influenced much by incarceration.
- 5 Q. Okay. So these would be static factors probably and may
- 6 not change as much with age?
- 7 A. That's correct.
- 8 Q. As opposed to the Static-99, if I understand your
- 9 explanation?
- 10 A. The Static-99, likewise, is static. There are -- it looks
- 11 at static factors, but age, in this case, is not static. It
- 12 would be changeable. Static factors are something that are
- 13 more malleable within a brief period of time, such as
- 14 attitudes, degree of sexual drive, this kind of thing.
- 15 | Q. The final risk assessment -- or, I'm sorry, actually the
- 16 second to last is the SONAR. Now, the SONAR is an older scale.
- 17 Is that correct?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. So why do you still use it?
- 20 A. Well, the SONAR was written to accompany the Static-99 and
- 21 has been replaced by something called the STABLE and something
- 22 else called the ACUTE.
- 23 These are basically instruments that are developed in
- 24 Canada and are used by federal probation to give a ballpark
- 25 | estimate of somebody's -- of the degree of risk that a parolee

will present to probation officers and how much attention that they should spend, how many resources they should expend in terms of initially following and subsequently following somebody.

So the Sex Offender Needs Assessment Rating scale was a pilot scale. It was actually published, and there's a publication, Sexual Abuse, that references this.

The two other manuals, the ACUTE and the STABLE, have been written, but they keep changing all the time. It was only recently, within a couple of years ago, that a stable manual was finally decided upon.

So I use some of these assessments for -- as part of a research project, and it helps to have a printed publication that people can refer to which is stable. So I just use this for that stability. It approaches the same sort of variables, although not in as much detail as the more contemporary instruments. He had a score of six, putting him in the, I think, moderate risk category.

- Q. Okay. And what, if anything -- so that would be a moderate risk?
- A. Yes.

- Q. The same question with respect to that risk assessment tool. What, if any, impact would age have on it, on the results?
- A. Well, I think that age would -- age is not particularly a

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

factor there, but sort of treatment would have a substantial factor on it. These concern attitudes that -- cognitive distortions that an individual might have, as well as other factors which are changeable.

So there would be some, I would say, benefit with increased time provided -- I think it would be more dependent upon the therapy that somebody had received rather than just the passage of time.

- Q. And the final risk assessment is detailed on Page 13, the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory. Again, why -- the first question is why, why did you administer this test, and then I'd like to talk to you in detail about your results.
- A. Well, actually, I began using this again maybe six, eight years ago. I actually began using it in the context of assessing child pornography offenders.

There was no good risk assessment instrument then, so I approached the author, the main author of the Static-99, a guy named Karl Hanson, and said, Karl, what should I use, and he suggested this Level of Service/Case Management Inventory, which is validated against broad populations of criminals, but it doesn't really sort of exclude child pornography offenders. It can be used sort of as an aggregate, as an instrument for all comers.

And it's broadly used not only for sex offenders, but for more general offenders. And this is, again, broadly used

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

in Canada. This is -- so that's why I used it. It just gives -- it's another tool that gives you some sense of -- some ability to assess somebody's risk. It has, actually, a benefit of including information on drugs and alcohol, which some of the instruments, other instruments, the Static-99 does not.

In terms of the specific score, he had a score of eight out of 43. The higher the score, the greater the risk. And this puts him in the fourth percentile, basically, in terms of risk of reoffense and need for services compared with individuals who are incarcerated and then the 25th percentile compared with individuals who are in the community. So ballpark, in a lesser risk category.

- Q. Do those results, the results of that test, surprise you at all?
- A. No. I mean, the sort of interesting thing about Mr. Augusta or notable thing is that he has no substantial prior criminal record, no prior criminal record. This is generally -- and this is consistent with that. He also has no substance use record. Both of those would increase his score substantially.
- Q. I think that concludes my review of the tests. I do have some specific questions, though, about a couple of things in the government's sentencing memorandum.

First of all, on Page 23, the government references Mr. Augusta's psychosis. Based on your evaluation, did you

- 1 | find any evidence at all of psychosis?
- 2 A. No. I mean, he's not psychotic. There's no history of
- 3 psychosis at all.
- 4 Q. And, additionally, and this is one of the things we
- 5 discussed this morning -- give me one moment to get to it.
- 6 There's a reference -- do you have a copy of the government's
- 7 sentencing memorandum in front of you? If you don't, I'm happy
- 8 | to provide you with a copy.
- 9 A. I'm not sure if it's in this large --
- 10 Q. It's not.
- 11 A. Okay. I don't.
- 12 Q. So let me just --
- 13 MS. FREESE: May I approach, Your Honor?
- 14 THE COURT: Yes.
- 15 BY MS. FREESE:
- 16 Q. I'm just going to ask you to take a look at this. And I've
- 17 | turned it, actually, to Page 11. And I'm going to direct your
- 18 attention towards the bottom of Page 11, Dr. Krueger.
- 19 **A.** Okay.
- 20 | Q. Eleven, twelve, thirteen, I quess really into fourteen it
- 21 discusses, perhaps, a suggestion by the defense or some
- 22 correlation about child molestation and then later becoming a
- 23 sex offender.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And did you review those portions of the sentencing

memorandum?

1

2

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. In your vast experience, what are the statistics with respect to sex offenders and gender?
- 5 A. The vast majority of sex offenders are male, 90,
- 95 percent. There are female sex offenders, but it's more a
- 7 male kind of behavior.
- Q. So knowing that, based upon your decades of experience, the
- 9 government indicates at the top of Page 12, If being sexually
- 10 abused makes one more likely to offend in a like manner, then
- 11 perhaps Defendant can explain why girls, who make up a
- 12 disproportionately large percentage of child exploitation
- 13 victims, do not also make up an equally large percentage of
- 14 child exploitation offenders.
- So I'm interested, particularly, in whether you have
- 16 any opinion on that statement.
- 17 A. Well, I mean, they make up some. I mean, I think that
- 18 | broad epidemiologic surveys indicate that roughly 20 percent of
- 19 females and 10 percent of males will have been sexually abused.
- 20 This is present in the U.S., in Canada, in Great Britain, and
- 21 other studies. Of those who have been sexually abused, the
- 22 | vast majority don't go on to sexually abuse.
- I think if you look at sexual offenders, I reviewed
- 24 | this literature some time ago, not more recently, but there's
- 25 | roughly -- and there are articles which are -- come down on

Direct/Freese - Dr. Krueger

either side of this, but that roughly somebody who commits a sexual offense has roughly twice the likelihood of having themselves been sexually abused.

So it becomes a risk factor, which, you know, I would say is much more operative in men. I'm not even sure if this stat is available for women or not. But when I looked at it, it was for basically male, for male populations.

Q. And there was also cited to in the government's memorandum some literature that suggested a defendant could fabricate an instance of sexual abuse for purposes of litigation, maybe by -- I think the quote was an enthusiastic defense attorney.

In your experience, you know, have you encountered this, where one fabricates that?

- A. Sure. I mean, this happens -- this would be understood.

 In fact, he, Mr. Augusta, denied -- I asked him if he had been sexually abused. He denied this, repeatedly denied it.
- Q. Did you ask him that more than once, Dr. Krueger?
- A. Yes. I mean, I was quite surprised by this whole thing.

 And then sort of as I was writing this out, even in the time of the interview, it became -- it struck me that, I mean, as a
- juvenile, if he's interacting with adults in cybersexual
 interactions, he's clearly a victim in that circumstance and I
 would say sexually abused.
 - Q. So in conclusion, I just have a couple questions about specific opinions, whether or not you were able to reach them

in this instance.

Based upon specifically the Static-99R, do you have -- are you able to offer any opinion today to the court with respect to Mr. Augusta's risk of recidivism?

A. Yes.

- Q. And what, if any, opinion can you offer?
- A. Going forward, just by virtue of age and his scores, it
 would be sort of moderate low according to the old scoring,
 sort of average, I think, according to new scoring. My overall
 estimate is that I think that he would be at a moderate or low
 risk going forward.
 - Q. And based upon the fact that he's serving a 45-year sentence in state prison, what, if any, opinions are you able to offer about his risk of recidivism in 45 years from now?

 A. Again, what I just said, had anticipated that, but I would say it would be a moderate low or low 45 years from now. It

would be reduced if he were to have some therapy. I think it would be very well managed with, you know, tight conditions of federal probation, for instance.

In my opinion, he could be managed in the community now. I mean, federal probation has a very strong control over somebody. These were Internet crimes. They could easily monitor his Internet activity, his residence.

Q. But they were also contact offenses. I mean, you understand that.

- A. I understand that, but, you know, there are many contact offenders -- we have a small sex offender program. There are many contact offenders that we monitor in the community.
 - Q. Do you have an opinion as to whether Mr. Augusta is a good candidate for treatment?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 Q. And why do you believe he's a good --
- A. Yes, my opinion is that he would be, you know, good. I mean, look, he's bright, he's obviously motivated, and, you know, he's amenable to treatment, amenable to therapy.
- 11 Q. I want to sort of jump back even though this is in the 12 facts. Is there any --
 - MS. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, but I just want to make sure I understood what the doctor said before Ms. Freese moves on.
 - THE COURT: Just a second. Is Mr. Berry going to be handling this witness or are you?
 - MS. TAYLOR: He's likely to do Mr. Krueger's cross, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Well, then I want him to be the person to speak on this witness.
 - MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.
 - MR. BERRY: Your Honor, I think there was just sort of a note-taking issue. We wanted to make sure we understood him before we move forward.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERRY: Which is that did the doctor say that the defendant would be a good candidate for treatment and that he could be managed in the community now, is what we were trying to make sure we understood.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I would say that's my opinion.

MR. BERRY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MS. FREESE:

Q. One of the things I -- and it didn't really come up in the context of the tests that you administered, but in your experience of evaluating sex offenders, what, if any, significance is there attached to whether a contact victim is known or is a stranger? Is there any significance there?

A. Yes. Let's say within the Static-99, there's a very thorough, detailed explanation of these definitions. A stranger is somebody that's -- in which sexual abuse has started to occur within 24 hours of somebody having met this particular individual, the victim.

So that a stranger victim, if somebody is identified as a stranger, would imply sort of predatory, typically predatory behavior, where somebody is out recruiting, is not -- most sexual abuse victims will know, have had some prior contact or some knowledge of their victimizer, I think up to 90 percent. But if there's a stranger victim, this would imply

- 1 both -- would imply increased risk of reoffense, basically.
- Q. And was there anything that you reviewed in this case to
- 3 indicate that there was any stranger contact victims?
- 4 A. There was not.
- Q. Okay. So what, if any, you know, significance then does
- 6 that have?
- 7 A. Well, again, I indicated in my report that this was
- 8 essentially an incest crime, basically within the family, which
- 9 is the lowest risk category. In reviewing the presentence
- 10 memorandum, there was another -- I think a minor victim who was
- 11 not related. This was known to the -- to Mr. Augusta, but not
- 12 a stranger victim.
- Overall, I think that his criminal behavior was
- 14 popportunistic and related to his immediate environment and did
- 15 | not involve predatory behavior. And I think generally
- 16 | speaking, this would put him in a lower risk and easier to
- 17 | treat category.
- 18 Q. Dr. Krueger, my final questions are really just about the
- 19 report that you prepared in this matter. Okay? After you
- 20 | evaluated Mr. Augusta, did you transcribe notes of your
- 21 interview and your impressions?
- 22 **|** A. I did, yes.
- 23 Q. And you provided them to me?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 \parallel Q. And did you also prepare a draft report in this matter?

I configured, you know, on my computer a report that I 1 emailed to you. This was a draft. I think there was one 2 change with an area code or some such thing as that. But there 3 4 was no other draft report. This is the -- the report was basically the final report that I gave you. 5 6 Q. And at any time did I suggest any revisions that you make 7 to the substantive portion of your report? A. No, no suggestions at all. 8 9 MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I have no further questions for Dr. Krueger. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 12 EXAMINATION BY THE COURT: 1.3 Dr. Krueger, as you evaluated the risk of recidivism, did 14 15 you factor in the disparate age of the defendant and the victim in this case? 16 17 A. Again, I'm aware of it in terms of age. The sort of age of a victim has not been, in various studies and so on, proven to 18 19 be a risk, a risk category, a risk factor. I mean, it's 20 obvious that this was his younger brother, there were infant 21 victims and so on, but this does not sort out to be a 22 particular risk factor. Q. Okay. And what about the length of time over which the 23 24 criminal conduct occurred or the repeated nature of the

25

assaults?

```
A. Again, I'm aware of this. I think in terms of validated
1
     measures, neither the length of time, number of victims, number
2
     of assaults are associated with risk of recidivism. It's
3
     basically -- the main factor is the imposition of the legal
4
     sanction and the violation in spite of that.
5
6
     Q. Okay. So the number of victims and the different types of
7
     criminal conduct would also not be factors?
     A. Well, in terms of an absolute risk of reoffense, they would
8
9
     not be factors. In terms of -- past behavior is the best
     predictor of future behavior.
10
11
     Q. Right.
```

A. If you were going to follow him, you would certainly be aware of this. But in terms of his actual risk of reoffense, it's not a demonstrated factor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Counsel, I'd like to see counsel in chambers in 15 minutes. We'll look at the documents that the defense has disclosed, and then we can make a determination of whether we can resume now or after the lunch hour has passed. So I'll see you at 12:15.

MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court is in recess.

(Luncheon recess taken.)

THE COURT: Ms. Taylor, I see you at the podium, so that suggests to me that you're going to cross-examine Ms. Luck.

1

4

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. We did ask Ms. Freese if she would inquire of the witnesses in terms of their travel 2 3 plans which one needed to leave first, and I believe Ms. Luck indicated --5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MS. TAYLOR: If we could take her first, if that would 7 be okay with the court. THE COURT: That's fine. 8 9 MS. TAYLOR: But, Your Honor, I believe Ms. Freese had a matter she wanted to put on the record briefly before we got 10 started. 11 12 THE COURT: All right. MS. FREESE: First I would note for the record that 13 Dr. Krueger is leaving the courtroom. Thank you, Dr. Krueger. 14 15 Second, Your Honor, I just wanted to memorialize on the record the court's ruling and our discussion in chambers, 16 17 that the government obviously moved on the record for 18 disclosure of certain documents pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 26.2, that I objected to the disclosure of 19 20 that document, those documents; however, the court conducted an 21 in-camera review and granted the government's request with 22 respect to three emails and two draft reports, one being of Ms. Luck, the other of Dr. Krueger. 23 24 In support of my objection, I took the position that 25 the material at hand did not constitute a statement and invoked 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the work product privilege. The court overruled that objection, and in accord with the court's order, I turned over the documents. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Where is the witness? Okay. MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, we would just ask Ms. Luck to retake the stand. THE COURT: Ms. Luck, you're still under oath. THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. TAYLOR: Q. Ms. Luck, on direct examination, you indicated that one of the most significant -- those were the terms you used, the "most significant" -- witnesses that you interviewed was Ruben Augusta. Do you recall that testimony? Yes. Α. Now, Mr. Augusta is the gentleman who, according to the DNA test, was excluded from being the father of the defendant? That's correct. Α. Now, Mr. Augusta, Mr. Ruben Augusta, he provided you no information about this defendant that occurred in the past, say, five years? A. That's correct. And he provided you no information about this defendant

- 1 that would have occurred over the past ten years?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. Yet it was your opinion that he was one of the most
- 4 significant witnesses that you spoke with?
- 5 A. These were all significant witnesses that I spoke to.
- 6 Q. But your testimony was that he was one of the most
- 7 | significant?
- 8 A. They're all significant.
- 9 Q. Now, the DNA test that you had an opportunity to review,
- 10 | that did not establish who the defendant's father was?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 \blacksquare Q. It simply says that Ruben Augusta was excluded?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 | Q. Yet your report indicates that Kenneth Hunter is the
- 15 | biological father of the defendant?
- 16 A. Yes, as far as we know.
- 17 Q. Now, that's simply based on speculation by witnesses that
- 18 you spoke to. Right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. You didn't speak with Kenneth Hunter, did you?
- 21 | A. No, I didn't.
- 22 Q. How about the defendant's grandmother, Sarah, you didn't
- 23 speak with her, did you?
- 24 A. No. I didn't have that opportunity to.
- 25 Q. Now, you also didn't have the opportunity to speak with the

- defendant's mother, Kendra, who you mentioned an awful lot throughout your report. Right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Because she's in a vegetative state?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Q. And you mention in your report purportedly a reason why
- 7 | she's in that state?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Now, your report also indicates, in the first couple of
- 10 pages, a number of documents that you reviewed. At my count,
- 11 | it was over 60 documents that you would have reviewed that were
- 12 connected to this case?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Including the discovery in this case, in the co-defendants
- 15 of the case?
- 16 \blacksquare A. What discovery was sent to me, yes, that's correct.
- 17 | Q. In reviewing the discovery, do you recall reviewing the
- 18 online chats of the defendant that discuss that he, in fact,
- 19 put his mother in that vegetative state once she discovered
- 20 that he had been raping his brother?
- 21 A. I don't recall that.
- 22 Q. Now, Ms. Freese asked you some questions about what she
- 23 called the early teen years of the defendant. She defined that
- 24 | time period as when he was 11, 12, and 13 years old.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. Now, you indicated that the defendant, at around the age of
- 2 | 12, reported to you that he entered online chat rooms with
- 3 older men, and those chats were sexualized. Do you recall
- 4 | that?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You also indicated that these chats developed into physical
- 7 sexual contact?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Did you have an opportunity to review Dr. Krueger's report
- 10 or speak with him about his findings?
- 11 A. I did review Dr. Krueger's report.
- 12 | Q. Then it must have surprised you that what the defendant
- 13 self-reported to Dr. Krueger was different than what he
- 14 self-reported to you as to that issue?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Well, you have the binder of the defendant's exhibits
- 17 before you?
- 18 **A.** Yes.
- 19 Q. Dr. Krueger's report is contained in that binder, and it
- 20 | indicates that he did not have sexual contact with --
- 21 | A. Can you refer me to the page, please?
- 22 Q. Sure. Dr. Krueger's report should be behind Tab 4, I
- 23 believe. Do you see that?
- 24 A. And what page are we referring to?
- 25 Q. And it's Pages 4 and 5. But looking at Page 4 --

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. -- do you see that he's discussing his sexual -- the
 defendant's self-report of sexual activities at the age of six?
- 4 A. I thought you were asking me about the chat rooms.
- 5 Q. That's on Page 5.
- A. Yeah, on Page 5, it says at the age of 12, he would go to chat rooms and initially engaged in nonsexual chatting, which
- 8 became quite compulsive, and then it grew into become sexual.
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 \blacksquare A. That's what I had said. That's what he had told me.
- Q. And does it say that he engaged in sexual contact with an
- adult at the age of 12? If you look at the top of Page 5, the
- 13 first full paragraph.
- 14 A. He said at age 13, he experimented sexually with a
 15 year-old boy. This is not about the chat rooms, though.
- Q. In the middle of that paragraph, he said he had no other physical contacts until he was 18.
- 18 A. I don't think he's referring to the chat room there.
- 19 Q. Can you show me then where in Dr. Krueger's report he talks
- about having sexual contact with an adult connected to the chat
- 21 rooms?
- 22 A. I have to go through the report and read it again. Okay.
- 23 Q. At the bottom of Page 4 is where he talks about his history
- 24 of sexual development, and he talks about engaging with
- 25 another -- at the age of six, he engages with another

- six-year-old in oral sex; at the age of 12, oral sex with a 14-year-old.
- A. Okay. And he did engage in sexual relations with other individuals at age -- that he met in the chat room.
 - Q. You're at the bottom of page --
- A. No, I'm just telling you what my report has said, and that's what he had told me.
- 8 Q. I'm not on your report, I'm on Dr. Krueger's report.
- 9 A. Okay.

5

- Q. Then at the age of 13, he experimented with a 15-year-old, mutual masturbation, at the age of 15.
- 12 A. I think you're better off discussing that with Dr. Krueger.
- Q. I'm asking you if you were surprised to find out that his self-report to Dr. Krueger was different than his self-report
- 15 to you.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. No, I don't think it necessarily was. Maybe it just wasn't included in here, but that's what he reported to me. And I'm sure that's -- I'm quite confident that's what happened.
- Q. Okay. But does it say in here that at the age of 12, he was having sex with adults? Because when I'm looking through his sexual history at the age of 12, I don't -- he talks about his sexual activities, and I'm not seeing that.
 - I see the paragraph where he talks about him chatting online, but he doesn't report it going further, as far as I can tell. Do you see anything else?

- 1 A. I think you should address that with him, with Dr. Krueger.
- 2 Q. In the review of the materials that you did, you saw that
- 3 the defendant has -- his self-reporting has been questioned
- 4 before. Right?
- 5 A. In reference to what?
- 6 Q. To self-reporting to a doctor.
- 7 A. Specifically, what are you referring to?
- Q. Take a look at Exhibit 9, please, in the binder. And I
- 9 would direct you to page -- I believe if you look at -- there
- 10 are a couple of page numbers in this document.
- 11 So if we look at the page numbers that go by -- where
- 12 | it says at the top left-hand corner, William Hunter, followed
- 13 | by the page number and then the date, which is August 12th of
- 14 108, you're looking for William Hunter, Page 5.
- 15 A. Okay.
- 16 Q. The heading of that paragraph says, Appearance, Demeanor,
- 17 and Mental Status. Are you on that page?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. The middle of that paragraph, there's a line that says, The
- 20 veracity of his self-report was questionable.
- 21 A. I see where that particular person made that assessment.
- 22 | Q. Did you have an opportunity to review this document that's
- 23 tabbed as -- in the defendant's binder as Tab 9? Now, this is
- 24 the Pennsylvania Counseling Services, Children's Services,
- 25 psychological evaluation done of the defendant when he was age

- 1 | 12 back on August 12th of 2008.
 - A. Yes.

- 3 Q. So you saw that the defendant's -- the veracity of his
- 4 self-reporting was questioned, has been questioned by Dr. Brian
- 5 Andrews, who is a licensed psychologist in Pennsylvania,
- 6 before?
- 7 A. Yes. In many cases, what happens is, on these evaluations,
- 8 | they do not have access to all the information and the --
- 9 Q. Are you questioning this particular doctor's report? Did
- 10 you have an opportunity to talk to him?
- 11 A. I'm just -- I wanted to share something, or should I just
- 12 wait for Ms. Freese?
- 13 | Q. I'm sure Ms. Freese will ask you some questions about it.
- 14 A. Okay, okay.
- 15 Q. You also testified about the defendant being the victim of
- 16 | bullying throughout his life. Right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. In fact, you said that at the age of 12, that he was kind
- 19 to the people he met and that he was a good friend to people.
- 20 Those were direct quotes that you made today on the stand.
- 21 A. In high school, when he started making friends, afterwards,
- 22 he really tried to be a good friend to the people that he met.
- 23 Q. Well, today what you said on the stand was, at the age of
- 24 | 12, he was kind to the people he met, and he was a good friend
- 25 \parallel to people.

- A. From going into high school, he tried -- he started to make
 friends for the first time, and it was a very positive
 situation where he was very -- he tried to be very loving,
- 4 considering that he was never shown anything close to love
- 5 himself.
- 6 Q. Now, you don't have any personal knowledge of that. Right?
- 7 A. When your father calls you a faggot and your mother beats
- 8 you up and your father beats you up, that would be a home
- 9 | that's not very loving.
- 10 Q. But you don't know that those things happened. Right? You
- 11 have been told those things.
- 12 A. If you're a probation officer and you're doing an
- 13 | investigation, that's what you would put in your report as
- 14 information. I have reached out to many other people, much
- 15 more than in a probation investigation, so I'm quite satisfied
- with the material that was in this report, very much satisfied.
- 17 Q. You were just questioning the report of another licensed
- 18 psychologist.
- 19 A. Because he didn't have the opportunity to have all the
- 20 information that I had and interview the same parties that I
- 21 interviewed and had as much information.
- 22 Q. Do you know what Dr. Brian Andrews would have had before
- 23 | him in 2008?
- 24 A. I don't think he would have had the whole history. And we
- 25 were very intent on obtaining as many records as we could.

Q. Isn't it true that the defendant has actually been the bully, not the victim, in the incidents that have been documented?

MS. FREESE: Objection. Argumentative.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: It's not uncommon for someone that's bullied to eventually be the bully. In fact, that's one of the reasons that these bullying situations occur.

BY MS. TAYLOR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Ma'am, I'm not asking you to generalize. I'm asking you specifically.
 - A. But I'm answering in a factual way, as well. Yes, there were situations that he bullied, but I guess there was a certain period of time that he had enough of being the victim, and they do stand up eventually. That's very common in bullying situations.
 - Q. You didn't include that, though, in your report, did you?
- 18 A. No, it's not there.
- 19 Q. In the same report that we were just looking at behind Tab
- 9, that counseling report when the defendant was 12, the
- 21 psychological evaluation, if you could take a look at that on
- Page 2. Again, I'm going on the page numbers at the top in the
- 23 | left-hand corner.
- Now, this is, again, when the defendant is only 12, not when he's in high school, but when he's only 12, this

psychological evaluation describes an incident on Page 2 in the middle paragraph that's captioned, Relevant Information,

That middle paragraph describes an incident at a swimming pool at the YMCA in the summer of 2008, and it says the defendant became enraged. That's the word that this doctor used.

8 A. Okay.

Concerns.

3

4

5

6

7

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you see where I am?
- 10 A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. The sentence says, starts, For example, while attending camp during the summer of 2008, William became enraged with a female peer.
 - A. In the swimming pool at the YMCA who was teasing him.
 - Q. Right, that's the end of the sentence. And then it continues, He grappled with her and pulled her down under water, and had staff not intervened and jumped into the pool and dragged him off of her, William may well have drowned or seriously injured this peer.
 - A. We were dealing --
 - Q. I'm just asking, do you see that information in this?
 - A. Yes. And you see there was a teasing incident, and we have a child that was so severely damaged, that by the time he was eight years old, he made a suicide attempt and ends up in a psychiatric hospital at --

- Q. Ma'am, you see this doctor saying that he was teased at a swimming pool and he almost drowned a child when he was 12? Do
- 3 you see that's what it says?
- 4 A. Yes. He was a very traumatized child.
- 5 Q. And then the next paragraph, do you see what it says?
- 6 A. He was a victim of much abuse and bullying.
- 7 Q. Do you see the next paragraph?
- 8 A. Yes. Go ahead.
- 9 Q. It starts, During his sixth-grade year. That's the
- 10 following paragraph.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. It indicates, the following sentence, He is large for his
- 13 | size and tends to bully and dominate his peers. He often does
- 14 | not know how to interact with them otherwise and tends to
- 15 engage with children who are much younger than he is because
- 16 they are much easier for him to dominate and control. Do you
- 17 | see that indication there?
- 18 A. Yes. And also --
- 19 \parallel Q. That information is not in your report, is it?
- 20 A. No, but there are also situations where children are
- 21 | bullied, they tend to seek out younger children because they're
- 22 not as tormented by the younger children.
- 23 Q. Younger children like his younger brother?
- 24 A. I'm not saying that. I'm just saying in situations of
- 25 | bullying. And I'm sure you've probably read about that, as

- 1 well.
- Q. You mentioned the Pennsylvania Counseling report that we're referencing here in your report.
- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. But none of this information that I'm asking you about here
- 6 today, none of this is referenced in your report?
- 7 A. The report is quite lengthy, and there was a lot of
- 8 | material to go through. I didn't have to go through this whole
- 9 report. We already have it.
- 10 Q. But you specifically mention this report, and you
- 11 | specifically talk about bullying in your report.
- 12 A. And he was tremendously bullied and isolated. And there
- 13 were situations where he just was content just to sit by
- 14 | himself in the back of the classroom as to not be bullied and
- 15 bothered.
- 16 Q. But you think your report is accurate to only paint him as
- 17 | a victim of bullying and not to bring out the fact that he was
- 18 a bully at points in time?
- 19 A. I think the report is very accurate speaking about the
- 20 trauma this young man had gone through, which was incredibly
- 21 mind-boggling what he had suffered.
- 22 Q. Who wrote your report?
- 23 A. Who wrote my report?
- 24 | Q. Yes, ma'am.
- 25 \blacksquare A. What's that supposed to mean?

- 1 | Q. I'm sorry, the question wasn't clear?
- 2 A. Who wrote my report?
- 3 Q. Who wrote your report?
- 4 A. I wrote my report.
- 5 Q. The final version that we have was not the only version.
- 6 Right?
- 7 A. Yes, there was editing to my report. Yes.
- 8 Q. There's a version dated July 12th, 2017. Right?
- 9 A. A version? You mean an edit?
- 10 | Q. There's a version of your report that's not the final
- 11 | version that we received that's dated --
- 12 A. Yes, the report was edited grammatically and to make it
- 13 read more smoothly.
- 14 Q. And this first version dated July 12th, 2017, is it your
- 16 A. Yes. It's not a version, it's the same report. It was
- 17 | just edited and made a little bit more readable.
- 18 Q. Now, the Public Defender's Office asked you to edit certain
- 19 | things that were in it, though. Correct?
- 20 A. To make it more readable. They wanted a more flowing
- 21 report instead of just facts after facts.
- 22 Q. Well, the July 12th version starts off with the defendant's
- 23 name. Right?
- 24 A. And we just tried to put the -- we were just explaining,
- 25 | trying to make it easier to understand who the people were

- 1 within the report.
- 2 Q. And the final version that was provided to the government
- 3 | that's dated October 12th, the defendant's name is not at the
- 4 | beginning of the report?
- 5 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 6 Q. Now the beginning of the report starts off talking about
- 7 | how Kenneth Hunter is a criminal?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. As though the focus of the report is now not the defendant?
- 10 A. No, the focus of the report is not Kenny Hunter. It's
- 11 | talking about -- it's a family history, it's a social history,
- 12 and we started -- rather than mentioning him first, we
- 13 mentioned his father first.
- 14 | Q. Mr. Hunter, that's the person who a number of people
- 15 speculate is the defendant's father?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And that's also a witness that you didn't speak to?
- 18 A. Well, we wanted to speak to him. He didn't want to be
- 19 interviewed.
- 20 \blacksquare Q. And his grandmother who he lived with for most of his life,
- 21 another witness that you didn't speak to?
- 22 A. No, we wanted to interview her, as well, and would not be
- 23 interviewed.
- 24 Q. What about his mother's caregivers, did you have an
- 25 opportunity to speak with them?

- 1 A. No, I did not.
- 2 Q. So all the information about the medical condition of the
- 3 defendant's mother came from the defendant and other
- 4 witnesses --
- 5 A. Yes.

- 6 Q. -- who are speculating on what her medical condition is?
- 7 A. No, his aunt actually went to see her, his paternal aunt.
 - 0. She went to see her and then --
- 9 A. Said she was in a -- that she was in a very bad vegetative
- 10 state. She couldn't speak to her. She didn't initially know
- 11 how damaged she was until she saw her in person.
- 12 Q. But how she ended up in that state --
- 13 A. She visited her while she was --
- 14 | Q. -- that information was speculation given to you?
- 15 \parallel A. That was information that William had given me.
- 16 Q. His self-reporting?
- 17 A. Yes. I don't have a release signed by her because she
- 18 wasn't in the state to sign a release to get her medical
- 19 reports.
- 20 Q. And no attempts were made to have any release signed?
- 21 \parallel A. She's in a vegetative state. It couldn't be signed.
- 22 | Q. By other family members or the court?
- 23 A. We didn't have a court order to get her medical records.
- 24 | Q. And no attempts were made to get a court order, was my
- 25 | question?

- A. No, there were no attempts made to get a court order to get her medical records. We know she's in a vegetative state.
- Q. My question is about how she got in that vegetative state.
- 4 Your information about that is simply speculative from
- 5 | witnesses or from the defendant?
- 6 A. From witnesses and the defendant.
 - MS. TAYLOR: That's all I have, Your Honor.
- 8 THE COURT: Ms. Freese.
- 9 MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor, just briefly.
 - REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 11 BY MS. FREESE:
- 12 Q. Ms. Luck, you were asked on cross some questions about your
- 13 | investigation regarding my client's father.
- 14 A. Yes.

7

- 15 \parallel Q. Biological father. And I think this is pretty clear,
- 16 | that -- am I correct that the paternity tests that you reviewed
- 17 | and provided that are in the binders excluded Ruben Augusta as
- 18 \parallel the biological father? Is that right?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 | Q. Did you review school records in this matter?
- 21 A. Yes, I did.
- 22 \parallel Q. And what name were the school records under?
- 23 A. His father was named as Kenny Hunter.
- 24 | Q. And did the last name on the school records reflect Hunter?
- 25 A. It did.

- 1 Q. And did the mother's name in the school records reflect
- 2 Hunter?
- 3 A. Yes, they did.
- 4 Q. Did you interview any other witnesses that told you that
- 5 Kenneth Hunter was his biological father?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And did one witness tell you that he looked just like him?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Based upon your investigation, did you receive any
- 10 information indicating that someone other than Mr. Augusta or
- 11 Mr. Hunter were the biological father?
- 12 A. Never.
- 13 Q. You were also asked some questions about -- and I don't
- 14 | know if you're there in your binder, Tab 19, that you reviewed
- 15 | the Pennsylvania Counseling Services records. I'll give you a
- 16 minute to get that.
- 17 A. Okay. Tab 19 is Carlisle High School.
- 18 Q. I'm sorry, my apologies. It's Number 9. I'm sorry.
- 19 A. Yes. I'm there.
- 20 Q. Okay. Thank you. So under "residence" on the first page
- 21 of those reports, under "other child services" -- do you see
- 22 where I am that's underlined on the first page?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Is there any indication here whether or not this was at or
- 25 about the time that Children and Youth Services had an open

- 1 | file in this matter?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And in 2008, am I correct that based on his date of birth
- 4 | listed here, that he'd be approximately 12 years old? Is that
- 5 | right?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 | Q. In fact, that's actually stated in the records?
- 8 A. Um-hum.
- 9 Q. So to the extent that there's any self-report there, was
- 10 this prior to his involvement in any sexualized chat rooms?
- 11 **A.** It was.
- 12 Q. Okay. And if you turn, you were asked some specific
- 13 | questions about -- and, again, I think Ms. Taylor directed you
- 14 to Page 6 -- my apologies, something else underlined, Page 7
- 15 | (sic) of those where there was a statement she asked you about
- 16 where the doctor said the veracity of his self-report was
- 17 | questionable.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. At that point did it appear that he was being asked
- 20 anything at all about his sexual development or anything?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 | Q. Now, you were asked a number of questions -- well, first
- about some attempted interviews, and you sort of got to this, I
- 24 | think, at the end of your cross. Did you attempt to locate and
- 25 interview Kenneth Hunter?

- 1 A. Yes, I did. I spoke to his sister, and the sister was
- 2 asked -- I asked her if she could reach out to him on our
- 3 behalf and have him speak to us. And we got back to her, and
- 4 she said, no, he was not interested in speaking to us.
- 5 Q. Okay. So you did attempt it?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. And I'd like to talk to you, as well, about William's
- 8 grandmother.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Was she a person of interest that you would have liked to
- 11 interview?
- 12 A. Yes, very much so.
- 13 Q. Okay. What, if any, attempts did you make, Ms. Luck, to
- 14 try to interview her?
- 15 \parallel A. We had attempted to reach out to her and had no luck in
- 16 having her call us back to speak with us.
- 17 Q. So, again, you wanted to interview her. Right?
- 18 A. Yes, very much so.
- 19 Q. Now, you were asked a number of questions about
- 20 Dr. Krueger's report. Do you happen to have it up there, Page
- 21 4? Or, excuse me, Exhibit 4.
- 22 A. I'll get it. Yes.
- 23 Q. Okay. Specifically, I'm going to direct your attention to
- 24 Page 5.
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. Now, on cross-examination, do you recall Ms. Taylor asking
- 2 you a number of questions with respect to purported
- 3 inconsistencies? Do you recall that?
- 4 A. Yes, I do.
- 5 Q. And one of the concerns -- most of those questions were
- 6 directed towards his self-report of sexual interactions with
- 7 older men when he was a minor?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Is that correct?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at a second full
- 12 paragraph, which starts with, Mr. Augusta, comma, when asked
- 13 further. Do you see that?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. I'm going to ask you to read the first seven lines of
- 16 Dr. Krueger's report.
- 17 A. Okay. (Reading:) Mr. Augusta, when asked further about
- 18 his sexual behavior, said at the age of 12 or 13, he would go
- 19 | into chat rooms. He said that initially he was engaged in
- 20 nonsexual chatting, which at times became compulsive. He said
- 21 | that this chatting grew to include not one, but several
- 22 | individuals who would participate and that it became sexual.
- 23 He said he would engage in role-play in which he would
- 24 adopt the role of a victim and have others abuse him. He did
- 25 this for about a year or two, he said. And then when he was 14

```
or so, members of the audience would ask him if he had a
1
     younger brother or sister, and he would engage in sexualized
2
     conversations involving himself.
3
     Q. Okay. Is there anything about that information in
4
     Dr. Krueger's report that's inconsistent with what he told you?
5
 6
     A. No.
7
              MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I have no further questions
     for Ms. Luck.
8
9
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Does that conclude
     the testimony of this witness?
10
              MS. TAYLOR: I just have one brief question.
11
12
              THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
1.3
                           RECROSS-EXAMINATION
14
     BY MS. TAYLOR:
15
     Q. Ma'am, you don't think there's an inconsistency between
     physical sexual contact and role-play that's online?
16
17
     A. He had physical contact, as well, if that's what you're
     asking me, yes.
18
19
         I'm not understanding your answer.
20
        Is there a difference? There's a difference, yes, but he
21
     had sexual contact, as well.
22
         In Dr. Krueger's report or in your report are you referring
     to?
23
24
     A. In both.
```

MS. TAYLOR: I think that makes it clear, Your Honor.

```
1
     Thank you.
2
              THE COURT: Thank you.
 3
              THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. Am I excused?
 4
              MS. FREESE: I have no additional questions.
              THE COURT: Yes.
5
 6
              THE WITNESS: Thank you.
7
              MR. BERRY: Your Honor, Dr. Krueger is on the stand.
     May I proceed?
8
9
              THE COURT: You may.
10
              MR. BERRY: Thank you.
                             CROSS-EXAMINATION
11
     BY MR. BERRY:
12
        Good afternoon, Dr. Krueger. How are you today?
13
14
         Fine.
                Thanks.
     Α.
15
        Great.
                 Now, in the report that you generated, the 16-page
     report that we talked about here today, your
16
17
     opinion/recommendation section at the very end, Page 16, you
     have a few opinions and recommendations that you make in there.
18
19
              One of them is that Mr. Augusta's ACE score is the
20
     worst that you've seen in your career, and you testified you've
21
     now had one slightly worse than that. Correct?
22
     Α.
         Yes.
         You also put in there that you see his risk of recidivism
23
24
     ranges from moderate high to moderate to low, depending on the
25
     diagnostic tool. Correct?
```

- A. Yes, or the circumstances of release.
- 2 Q. Okay. You also put in that section that Augusta is an
- 3 excellent candidate for sex offender-specific therapy.
- 4 | Correct?

- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You also say that his prognosis for treatment is, quote,
- 7 good. Correct?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. You say that Augusta is at a significant risk of being
- 10 sexually abused in prison. That's one of your final
- 11 recommendations or opinions. Correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And that you believe that he could be safely managed in the
- 14 | community. Correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Are there any other sort of major salient opinions or
- 17 recommendations that you want to add to that section here today
- 18 before we move forward?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 | Q. Okay. Now, your opinion and recommendations, what I call
- 21 the output, comes from a set of inputs. Fair to say?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. All right. And those inputs, for simple purposes of my
- 24 country lawyer, West Texas brain, I break it into three
- 25 categories. And one of them is pretty important and Ms. Freese

- 1 mentions it to you and she says it's the interview you did of
- 2 Augusta for five hours on June 22nd, 2017. That's one pretty
- 3 specific input. Correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And then you also review a number of documentary items,
- 6 pieces of information from the case file, discovery materials,
- 7 | medical records, Ms. Luck's report. Those are all sort of one
- 8 category of inputs. Is that fair to say?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And then sort of your third basis for your opinion,
- 11 interview, documentary exhibits or information, and then the
- 12 diagnostic tools that you applied to Mr. Augusta's case.
- 13 | Correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Now, on those diagnostic tools or psychiatric testing,
- 16 Tests 1 to 10 test the -- test to assess the deviant and
- 17 | nondeviant sexual behavior. Right? That's one through ten?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And then even 11 to 15 test to screen for other psychiatric
- 20 symptoms. Correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And then 16 is sort of on its own, and it's the Hare
- 23 psychopathy test that you sometimes refer to as the PCL-R,
- 24 Psychopathy Checklist-Revised. Correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And then 17 to 20 are the actual risk assessment
- 2 instruments that you applied. Is that correct?
- 3 A. Yes, in addition to the Hare, which many would consider
- 4 important for risk assessment.
- 5 Q. Okay. So we'll lump the Hare into the risk assessment,
- 6 even though it's kind of set off by itself.
- 7 A. You could do that, sure.
- 8 Q. Okay. And that's sort of the way your report reads to me,
- 9 as well, just have it broken up differently in the report, so I
- 10 want to make sure I'm clear on your view of it.
- 11 Now, you agree, don't you, that some of the
- 12 | information you rely upon is subjective and some of it is more
- 13 | objective? Do you agree with that?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Give me an example of some of the objective information
- 16 | that you relied upon.
- 17 A. I think basically all the historical information and
- 18 documentation, which is listed in my list of sources of
- 19 | information. You know, this would include descriptions of
- 20 the -- as well as the -- well, descriptions of the abuse.
- 21 Q. Which abuse?
- 22 | A. Of the abuse of his -- of the Victim 1, basically.
- 23 | Q. The abuse he caused?
- 24 A. That's correct, that's what I mean.
- 25 Q. Go ahead.

- A. That would be one objective. The second objective source of information would be my observations of him, not his self-report, but what I see before me.
 - Q. Okay.

4

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- I think the third set of information of an objective nature 5 6 would be these various risk assessment instruments. 7 instance, the Static-99R, one can score not only in the absence of any history from him, you could -- and this is done, you 8 9 know, for a thousand individuals a year based on records by the New York State Office of Mental Health for screening for 10 individuals who are released into the community. So there are 11 12 sort of demographic factors which are not reported by this
- Q. So you consider the Static-99 one of the more objective of the instruments that you utilized?
- 16 A. Yeah, sure.

individual and objective.

- 17 | Q. Fair to say?
 - A. Yes, as well as the other risk assessment instruments. The Hare relies on both observation and interview. The SVR is a rating scale which relies upon documentation. The SONAR, the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory are also instruments which rely upon demographic information in addition to some subjective information.
 - Q. Okay. So you agree that some of those instruments contain some subjective information in them?

A. Sure.

- 2 | Q. What would you consider to be sort of the most
- 3 subjective -- we just talked about the objective, let's talk
- 4 about the subjective inputs that you received in making your
- 5 assessment. What would you say was the most subjective
- 6 information that helped you form part of your opinion?
- 7 A. His description of what arouses him sexually.
- 8 Q. Okay. Anything else?
- 9 A. His narration of his history, his narration of his crimes,
- 10 his responses to me as I went through a very -- a psychiatric
- 11 history. I mean, all these were based upon -- were based in
- 12 part upon his self-report.
- 13 | Q. So the self-report tends to be rather subjective by
- 14 definition?
- 15 A. Of course, yes.
- 16 Q. Right. Of the diagnostic tools that you utilized -- you
- 17 | rattled them off, the Static-99, the SVR-20, the SONAR, the
- 18 Hare psychopathy test, do you -- would you rate those on a
- 19 scale of subjective to objective, or do you think they're all
- 20 equally objective?
- 21 A. I think that probably some are more objective than others.
- 22 I think the Static --
- 23 Q. Educate us.
- 24 A. Well, I think the Static-99R relies upon demographic
- 25 | factors which are fixed and really immutable. I think that the

- 1 Level of Service/Case Management Inventory relies upon
- 2 subjective responses but also a review of records. But I think
- 3 | that that's an instrument which is largely based on objective
- 4 | information. I think the --
- 5 Q. All right. So let's go to the bottom of your list then.
- 6 We got your top two.
- 7 A. Okay.
- 8 Q. Give me your bottom two, most objective.
- 9 A. The bottom two I would say would be the SONAR and the -- I
- 10 would say the SONAR and the SVR-20.
- 11 Q. All right. Thank you. Let's talk about the Hare, PCL-R.
- 12 I'm going to call it the PCL-R just because I don't want it to
- 13 be spelled h-a-i-r in the transcript all day.
- 14 You agree that the PCL-R contains a lot of room for
- 15 | subjectivity on the part of the rater in this case. Don't you
- 16 agree?
- 17 | A. Sure.
- 18 Q. In fact, it's been criticized in the literature as
- 19 containing items that are, quote, hardly measurable and too
- 20 speculative and suggestive, end quote.
- 21 A. I don't know that particular statement. I would -- I think
- 22 that one could certainly make that statement about the Hare.
- 23 | Q. Not completely unreasonable to make that assessment, would
- 24 | it?
- 25 A. Yes.

Cross/Berry - Dr. Krueger MR. BERRY: May I approach the witness, Your Honor? 1 2 THE COURT: Yes. MR. BERRY: And I have this for Your Honor, as well. 3 BY MR. BERRY: 4 5 Do you see what I've handed you, Dr. Krueger? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. What is it? It's my scoring sheet for the Hare. 8 9 Q. And that's actually the one you did, correct, not just a blank? 10 11 A. Yes. MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United 12 States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 1. 13 14 MS. FREESE: No objection. 15 THE COURT: One is admitted. MR. BERRY: May I publish, Your Honor? 16 17 THE COURT: Yes. BY MR. BERRY: 18 Q. So let's zoom in on -- so just to be clear, Dr. Krueger, 19 this PCL-R has 20 criteria. Correct? 20 21 A. Yes. 22 They're basically contained on this sheet? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And it has them out to the side numbered one down to 25 twenty, and then you can rate them as a no, which gives a zero.

- 1 Correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. A maybe gets a one?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. A yes gets a two, and then you could select an omit, you
- 6 just didn't want to consider that one for whatever reason?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Okay. Now, we don't have to worry about the omit column
- 9 because you didn't do that on any of these. Correct?
- 10 A. I did not do it, yes.
- 11 \blacksquare Q. Everything gets something, a yes, a no, or a maybe. Right?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. So in terms of the items, you agree that you can't really
- 14 measure glibness and superficial charm in an objective and
- 15 | reliable way. Isn't that correct?
- 16 A. Well, I would say these are very -- these are vague and
- 17 somewhat difficult to categorize notions. However, there's a
- 18 manual which sets forth in a couple of paragraphs a description
- 19 of this item.
- 20 MR. BERRY: Objection. Nonresponsive, Your Honor.
- 21 BY MR. BERRY:
- 22 | Q. The question was, can you measure these in an objective and
- 23 reliable way?
- 24 A. I would say yes, you can.
- 25 Q. Really? What's the tool to do that?

A. The tool are individuals who are trained in the use of the Hare psychopathy checklist, who know well the criteria, who've, you know, had one or two levels of training, and who then interview somebody and who make a determination.

I mean, the Hare has been validated. There are easily a thousand peer-reviewed studies in many cultures, many countries, that support the validity of the Hare. So this is not objective like one could actually see something, but there is — one can train observers to make judgments, and these judgments with these trained observers can have a great degree of consistency.

- Q. A great degree of consistency, what we refer to as interrater reliability. Correct?
- A. Yes.

- Q. So two raters could look at this and arguably come up with different conclusions. Correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. So doesn't that make it more subjective than objective?
- A. Again, I would say that this is, within the literature, a test which is highly validated, which relies upon objective information. In fact, this test can be administered in the absence of any kind of interview. So somebody could sit down with a record, go through and rate a Hare if one is properly trained on the basis of a review and judgments about the particular behaviors that are described.

- Q. But to be clear, the instrument measuring whether it's yes,
- 2 no, or maybe on the glibness or superficial charm, the
- 3 instrument is a person, in this case you. Correct?
- 4 A. The instrument is a trained individual who is using a --
- 5 MR. BERRY: Objection. Nonresponsive.
- 6 BY MR. BERRY:
- 7 Q. Is it you or not?
- 8 A. If I administer the Hare, sure, it's me.
- 9 Q. You're the instrument. Correct?
- 10 A. No, the instrument is what's before us. It's a description
- 11 of the Hare psychopathy checklist and --
- 12 Q. The question, Dr. Krueger, was, can you measure glibness
- 13 and superficial charm with some instrument, and your answer is,
- 14 yes, a trained rater can do that. Correct?
- 15 A. Yes, sure.
- 16 Q. What about superficial? Like, what is -- how do you
- 17 measure whether the charm is superficial enough to be
- 18 pathological? Can we see that somehow?
- 19 A. Again, you would have to look at the paragraph, descriptive
- 20 paragraphs. I don't have the manual before me, but you would
- 21 read this paragraph carefully, you'd be trained on it again and
- 22 again and again, and there's agreement that you can establish
- 23 if this is present or not.
- 24 | Q. And it's the interpretation of that manual, of what is
- 25 considered superficial enough that you interpret and then apply

- 1 and decide yes, no, or maybe. Correct?
- 2 A. I would say not -- well, it's the reading of the manual,
- 3 yes, sure.
- 4 Q. Right. What about shallow affect? You can't measure the
- 5 difference between shallow and real, either, can you?
- 6 A. Again, using this methodology, you can, in my view.
- 7 There's a description of the item contained and training of it,
- 8 and you can get agreement among individuals who apply this.
- 9 And this is broadly accepted with huge -- it's probably the
- 10 most validated of instruments available for predicting risk.
- 11 Q. Oh, that's interesting, because didn't you say that the
- 12 Static-99 is the most validated?
- 13 A. The Hare is validated across a broad -- for all crimes,
- 14 basically. The Static-99 is more for sexual crimes.
- 15 \parallel Q. What about callousness and lack of empathy, can you measure
- 16 | that with an instrument of some kind? Is there a device that
- 17 you can say, ah, he's empathetic and he is not?
- 18 A. Again, using this methodology, you can, I believe.
- 19 \blacksquare Q. Again, it's the person making the decision. Right?
- 20 A. It's the trained professional using this manual who is
- 21 making a decision.
- 22 Q. Unlike, for example, the Static-99, which you rate as the
- 23 | highest objective one where it just simply looks at things like
- 24 was he convicted. Right? That's a yes/no, binary question.
- 25 Correct? That's pretty objective. You agree with that?

- 1 A. These are clear or binary questions, yes, but --
- Q. Whereas measuring someone's empathy, a little fuzzier. Do
- 3 you agree with that?
- 4 A. Yeah, sure.
- 5 Q. The same with lack of -- let me scroll down. Pardon me.
- 6 Lack of realistic long-term goals. When I was nine, I wanted
- 7 | to be a baseball player. Was that unrealistic?
- 8 A. For a nine-year-old, perhaps. I think that, again, there
- 9 are full-item descriptions as to how you arrive at this. I
- 10 don't have the manual, but they're very clearly described and
- 11 allow individuals to use this. And over the 30 years that the
- 12 Hare has been developed, there's vast literature that supports
- 13 its validity.
- 14 Q. But, again, it's going to be up to the rater, in this case
- 15 | you, to determine whether his goals are realistic or not. Yes
- 16 or no?
- 17 A. Yes, the rater using his training --
- 18 Q. I understand. Obviously your experience and your training
- 19 come into it. I get it. But ultimately it's the rater's
- 20 decision. Yes?
- 21 A. Yes, sure.
- 22 MR. BERRY: May I approach, Your Honor?
- 23 THE COURT: Yes.
- 24 BY MR. BERRY:
- 25 Q. Do you see what I've just handed you?

1 A. Yes.

2

- Q. What is it?
- 3 A. It's the SVR-20 coding sheet that I completed.
 - Q. Thank you.
- 5 MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United
- 6 States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 2.
- 8 MS. FREESE: No, Your Honor.
- 9 THE COURT: Two is admitted.
- 10 MR. BERRY: May I publish?
- 11 THE COURT: Yes.
- 12 MR. BERRY: Sorry, jumped the gun on that one.
- 13 BY MR. BERRY:
- 14 | Q. Now, Dr. Krueger, when we look at this one, just for ease
- 15 of reference for everyone else who is not quite as familiar
- 16 with your handwriting as yourself or even me at this point, is
- 17 | it safe to say if it's circled, it's a yes, and if it's not
- 18 circled, it's a no?
- 19 A. Yeah, sure.
- 20 Q. Because sometimes the Y's and the N's are hard for me, but
- 21 that's sort of the way you solidify your Y, right, is with a
- 22 | circle?
- 23 A. Sure.
- 24 Q. Okay.
- 25 A. Exactly.

- 1 Q. I think it's just helpful for everyone reading along. So
- 2 number three on this psychological -- or psychosocial
- 3 adjustment coding sheet here where it says "psychopathy,"
- 4 | that's basically you importing the Hare into this one and
- 5 saying, no, he doesn't make that finding. Correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Now, Question Number 2, is a victim of child abuse. You
- 8 have that in there. Right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Now, is that -- that comes from his self-report. Correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Which you said previously was some of the more subjective
- 13 information you received. Correct?
- 14 **|** A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Number 12 -- and some of this I'm just freewheeling here
- 16 because I don't really know what some of this means -- what is
- 17 | high-density offense? Explain that to me.
- 18 A. These would be a lot of offenses within a very specific
- 19 period of time. Like, somebody might go on a binge of sort of
- 20 sexual offending and, you know, engage in rape of many women
- 21 over a period of time.
- 22 Q. And get caught and keep doing it, or does it matter whether
- 23 they were convicted?
- 24 A. It doesn't matter. It's just a description of the
- 25 | frequency of events, frequency over time.

- Q. And you marked him as a no?
- 2 A. Yes.

- 3 Q. Are you sticking with that?
- 4 A. I would, yes.
- 5 Q. Number 19, lacks realistic plans. That's kind of similar
- 6 to the PCL-R question about long-term goals. Right?
- 7 A. Well, I mean, what realistic plan can he have? He's going
- 8 to be in jail for 30 years or 45 years. His plans are made out
- 9 for him, so --
- 10 MR. BERRY: Objection. Nonresponsive.
- 11 MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I object. I think he did
- 12 respond to the question.
- 13 BY MR. BERRY:
- 14 Q. Is this similar to the question in the Hare, the PCL-R,
- 15 | that talks about long-term goals, realistic or nonrealistic?
- 16 Is it similar?
- 17 A. Similar, sure.
- 18 Q. Okay. You marked him the same between those two,
- 19 basically. Right? He doesn't have unrealistic ones. Right?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. And then Number 20, negative attitude toward intervention,
- 22 that also you would consider is a subjective input. Correct?
- 23 A. Yes, it would rely upon an interview of him and his
- 24 response.
- 25 Q. Right.

Cross/Berry - Dr. Krueger MR. BERRY: Your Honor, the monitors are not on in the 1 2 gallery. Do we want to turn them on for people in the gallery? THE COURT: Sure. 3 4 MR. BERRY: May I approach? THE COURT: Yes. 5 6 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 7 BY MR. BERRY: Sure. I've just handed you what's been marked as 8 9 Government's Exhibit 3. Do you see that? Yes. 10 Α. Q. What is it? 11 12 A. It's the scoring sheet for the SONAR, S-O-N-A-R, which I 13 scored. MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United 14 15 States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 3. THE COURT: Any objection to three? 16 17 MS. FREESE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Three is admitted. 18 19 BY MR. BERRY: 20 Q. And just to be clear, Dr. Krueger, this is the one -- one 21 of the two that you've put at the bottom of your list in terms 22 of objective to subjective, meaning the bottom being the most -- one of the more subjective ones that you applied. 23 24 Correct?

25

Α.

Yes.

- Q. Now, on Page 2 of this particular exhibit, you've got your
- 2 scoring criteria there where you marked the six, basically, and
- 3 then out to the side, is that your handwriting that --
- 4 A. Yes, yes.
- 5 Q. The next page, if you look on your screen -- I don't know
- 6 that it's highlighted. On the screen, you'll see some
- 7 | highlighting in the version that's on that screen there. Do
- 8 you see that?
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. It's talking about intimacy deficits, which is one of the
- 11 scoring criteria. Correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And in the explanation that you're provided here as the
- 14 person being the rater, it sort of educates you a little bit
- 15 | and says, The degree of trouble should be sufficient to be of
- 16 concern to the man or his partner. You agree that's a pretty
- 17 subjective assessment, don't you?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. One of the other criteria is the social influence, and it
- 20 asks you whether a person is -- the number of people in his
- 21 life that are not paid to be in his life. So, for example,
- 22 Ms. Freese, unfortunately, doesn't count here, right, because
- 23 | she's paid to be in his life?
- 24 A. Sure.
- 25 Q. You don't count. You're paid to be in his life. Correct?

- 1 A. Sure.
- 2 Q. And so it talks about positive or negative influences. You
- 3 can't objectively measure positive or negative influences on a
- 4 person. Right? It's a subjective assessment. Do you agree
- 5 | with that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And then the attitude section, which you scored him with a
- 8 zero, meaning he doesn't have any agreement with these
- 9 particular attitudes, it's broken down into rape and child
- 10 molestation. Correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And it's based entirely on his answers to questions about
- 13 his attitudes towards rape and asks a series of questions and
- 14 attitudes towards child molestation and asks a series of
- 15 questions. Correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Entirely subjective on his part. Correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Now, you say that the Static-99 is what you consider to be
- 20 one of the more objective ones. Correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. You know that the manual says some scoring decisions do
- 23 require some judgment? You know that?
- 24 A. Sure, yeah.
- 25 Q. So there's some subjectivity even within the Static-99.

1 Correct?

- A. Sure.
- Q. And as you have mentioned here today, you agree that
- 4 there's clear acknowledgment that individuals under forensic
- 5 observation are historians -- as historians are poor historians
- 6 and it's hard to rely on them. Correct?
- 7 A. I would say the circumstances of -- generally speaking,
- 8 yes, the circumstances of forensic evaluation are such that
- 9 there's all sorts of different motives. Nevertheless, you
- 10 can -- this is not always true and you can get sometimes
- 11 remarkable admissions from someone.
- 12 Q. Do you remember testifying in the case of United States v.
- 13 Felix Cartegena in the Eastern District of New York in January,
- 14 2011?
- 15 A. It rings a bell, yes.
- 16 Q. You have it listed on your list of cases that you've
- 17 testified in.
- 18 **A.** Okay.
- 19 Q. So presumably it's -- I don't have the wrong Dr. Krueger.
- 20 In that, you said, at Page 12 of the transcript, Lines 7 to 10,
- 21 There is a clear acknowledgment that individuals under forensic
- 22 observation are poor historians and you can rely upon them, and
- 23 then you cut yourself off and you say --
- 24 MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I just request a copy of the
- 25 | transcript. Excuse me. I don't have -- I'm not privy to what

1 he's looking at.

2 (Handing.)

MS. FREESE: Thank you. What page were you on?

MR. BERRY: Page 12, Lines 7 to 10, of the Cartegena

transcript.

3

4

5

- BY MR. BERRY:
- Q. You say, The reliability is, quote, exceedingly questionable on self-report. Does that sound right?
- 9 A. Sure, yeah.
- 10 Q. You don't put that in your report, though, do you?
- 11 A. I did not indicate that specific disclaimer, no, in this report.
- 13 Q. In another transcript, in United States v. Rakesh Punn,
- 14 P-u-n-n, also in the Eastern District of New York -- this one
- was more recent, in December of 2015. Does that ring a bell?
- 16 A. Sure.
- 17 Q. In that one you said, It's a basic assumption that it could
- 18 not be truthful. And you're referring to, in that case, that
- defendant's self-report. And that is Page 47, Lines 2 to 5, of
- 20 the transcript. Does that sound about right?
- 21 A. Sure.
- 22 Q. You say, again, in that case, on Page 80, Lines 7 to 10,
- 23 His reliability is questionable. The most important evidence
- 24 was that provided by the government's investigation. Sound
- 25 about right?

- 1 A. Sure.
- Q. In your report, from Page 3 to 14 of your report, you refer
- 3 to "Augusta said" or "he said" 102 times. Does that sound
- 4 about right?
- 5 A. Sure.
- 6 Q. And you've cited other authors in your report. You talked
- 7 about Hanson and the other people that validate these
- 8 instruments. But nowhere in your report do you say that
- 9 Augusta's statements should be understood in the context of
- 10 reliability that is, quote, exceedingly questionable. You just
- 11 don't do that, do you?
- 12 A. I did not put that in the report, no.
- 13 | Q. If you would, please, turn to your report -- and the court
- 14 | may want to look at this, as well, Page 6. It's the first full
- 15 | paragraph. It starts with, Mr. Augusta said that since his
- 16 arrest he had been in custody. That's the first sentence.
- 17 When you're there, let me know.
- 18 A. Yeah, sure.
- 19 Q. Okay. In that paragraph, you say something that's puzzling
- 20 to me, and I'm hoping you can enlighten me. You say, a couple
- 21 lines down, Mr. Augusta also said that he had some child
- 22 pornography. He said that he would not use this or masturbate
- 23 to these images even though he had a substantial number of
- 24 | images in his possession.
- This is in the paragraph about him being in custody. \square

- 1 Are you saying that he had child pornography in jail?
- 2 A. No, no.
- 3 | Q. Okay.

- A. This is a reference to the past.
- 5 Q. Okay. Because in the previous paragraph, you're talking
- 6 about all the past stuff, but when you pivot to this paragraph,
- 7 you're talking about in custody, he's had, on several
- 8 occasions, other inmates that threatened him, said that he had
- 9 never been physically attacked or abused, all that's about
- 10 custody, and then you throw in this line about possession of
- 11 child pornography.
- 12 A. It was inartfully done, but yes.
- 13 | Q. I was giving you the benefit of the doubt, because I would
- 14 | have been really stunned if that was the case, so I appreciate
- 15 you making that clear for me.
- 16 Did you know that -- one of the things you reviewed
- 17 was Dr. Foley's report. Correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. In Dr. Foley's report on Page 3, he says that -- Augusta
- 20 tells Dr. Foley that he tried suicide at age eight. But on
- 21 Page 4 of your report, you say that he told you he tried
- 22 | suicide in high school. Did you note that discrepancy?
- 23 A. I did not note it, did not note it. I mean, it's not
- 24 unusual for there to be discrepancies. I mean, a history,
- 25 I'm -- just in the whole matter of narration and so on, I'm

- writing quickly, I dictate, there's substantial room for error, 1 2 and I would just say that this -- I think this is consistent in that he described this incident of attempted suicide at a young 3 age, eight, high school, whenever.
 - Eight, high school, whenever. Is that your testimony?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- That's just what I said. I think the -- what I was trying to convey is that there can be discrepancies in history, in the history that I obtain that are on the basis of transcription or of note-taking and so on.
- I think that the -- I would -- the fact that he contained -- that he made a suicide attempt at a young age has been documented, acquired and documented by several individuals, and I think that's the important feature.
- Q. Also, Augusta told Dr. Foley on Page 4 that he had oral sex with a 16-year-old, but he told you it was a 14-year-old. You didn't note that discrepancy in your report between you and Dr. Foley, either. Correct?
- I did not draw attention, even be aware of or draw attention to that discrepancy.
- Q. Augusta told Dr. Foley on Page 4 of his report that he also had sex at the age of 13 with, quote, another peer, Dr. Foley's term, but he told you it was with a 15-year-old. You didn't explain that discrepancy, either, did you?
- 24 A. Again, I did not go sort of line by line in terms of 25 discrepancies. There can be, oftentimes, a lot of discrepancy

- in history depending upon how the question is presented, how
 much challenge there is, and so on. It's a -- history is not a
 straightforward, objective matter.
 - Q. It could also be made up. Right?
 - A. Sure, that's a possibility.
- Q. Augusta told Foley that he had tried marijuana, but he told you only alcohol, no drugs. You didn't note that discrepancy, either, did you?
- 9 A. Correct.

4

- 10 Q. He also told you and you put in your report that, quote,
- 11 Perhaps a year prior to his arrest, he began slapping his
- 12 | brother and sexually abusing him, end quote. But what you
- 13 didn't do is explain in your report that he was minimizing,
- 14 because there is, in fact, video evidence that as early as
- 15 | March of 2013, a full 28 months before he was arrested, that he
- 16 was sexually abusing members of his family, including Victim 1
- 17 | in this case. You didn't note that, did you?
- 18 A. I did not note that. Again, this is a narrative acquired,
- 19 and there are -- you can acquire -- there's a lot of
- 20 | flexibility in terms of the information which can be obtained.
- 21 It depends upon the degree of denial or willingness of
- 22 somebody --
- 23 MR. BERRY: Objection. Nonresponsive.
- 24 BY MR. BERRY:
- 25 | Q. The question is yes or no. Did you include it in your

report?

- 2 A. Did I include what in my report?
- Q. That there was a discrepancy between what he told you and
- 4 what he told Dr. Foley?
- 5 A. I did not.
- 6 Q. Now, with regards to the self-report and being subjective
- 7 and exceedingly questionable as you have testified before,
- 8 there is an objective instrument, and you discussed it earlier
- 9 today. I'm going to call it the PPG just because I can't say
- 10 | the word, to be quite frank. Do you know what I'm referring
- 11 to?
- 12 A. Sure.
- 13 Q. Can you say it for me?
- 14 A. The penile plethysmograph.
- 15 | Q. There you go. Thank you. So for the record, I'm going to
- 16 call it the PPG, and that's often what it's shortened as.
- 17 Correct?
- 18 **A.** Sure.
- 19 Q. You could have used that to try to confirm or corroborate
- 20 some of the subjective information you got from Mr. Augusta.
- 21 That was at least an instrument that's available. Correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. But you didn't do that, did you?
- 24 A. Again, I think that I did not for many reasons.
- 25 Q. Now, let's talk about these instruments that you utilized,

- these risk assessment instruments. You agree that they are not predictive. Correct?
- A. Well, it depends what you mean by "predictive." They'll
- 4 give you a -- they'll give you some risk, but there's no
- 5 absolute prediction of one thing or another.
- Q. In the Cartegena case in January of 2011, you said, The
- 7 diagnostic tools allow you to assess risk of recidivism. You
- 8 can't predict future behavior. Right?
- 9 A. Sure, yeah.
- 10 | Q. So you agree they're not predictive. Correct?
- 11 A. Of course, yes.
- 12 | Q. And you agree that you personally cannot predict what this
- 13 man is going to do tomorrow or 45 years from now or 80 years
- 14 | from now?
- 15 A. Yes, I agree.
- 16 Q. You can't predict whether this defendant will rape again,
- 17 can you?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. All these tools do is establish a risk for a type of person
- 20 that has similar traits. Correct? Is that fair?
- 21 A. Well, I think it allows you to -- some of these instruments
- 22 rely upon other types, and they would develop a risk. I think
- 23 that a particular -- that an interview and this assessment
- 24 allows one to establish a risk for this particular person, a
- 25 risk of a general matter. These would rely on statistical

- databases for these other risk assessment instruments, but this
- 2 interview and this assessment were for Mr. Augusta in
- 3 particular.
- 4 Q. And even the Static-99, which seems to be one of your
- 5 favorites, cannot purport to make an individualized assessment
- 6 of future conduct any more than a life expectancy table can
- 7 provide an accurate prediction of when someone is going to die.
- 8 Do you agree with that?
- 9 A. Yes, I agree.
- 10 \blacksquare Q. In fact, do you know what the accuracy is of the Static-99?
- 11 A. I'm not sure what you're referring to. "Accuracy" is a
- 12 | broad word. I think that I would rely more upon its validation
- 13 research. It really depends on the particular study and the
- 14 particular study's concern.
- 15 | Q. Well, did you know that the manual itself uses the term and
- 16 says, quote, The Static-99R also has a number of weaknesses; on
- 17 average, it demonstrates only moderate predictive accuracy, end
- 18 quote? Do you know that?
- 19 A. That sounds like a statement emanating from the manual, and
- 20 | I would agree with it. I would concur with the manual.
- 21 | Q. You didn't put that in your report, did you?
- 22 A. I did not, no.
- 23 | Q. All right. Let's talk about the word "recidivism." We've
- 24 been throwing that around a lot today. It's a pretty important
- 25 word in this case. You never define it in your report. Can

- 1 you give me your definition of it today?
- 2 A. Recidivism would be the likelihood of somebody committing
- 3 another sexual crime.

- Q. Committing another sexual crime?
- 5 A. Yes, that would be sexual recidivism.
- 6 Q. In the manual of the Static-99, it says, quote, For
- 7 Static-99R, the recidivism criteria is considered a new charge
- 8 or conviction for a sex offense. That's different, don't you
- 9 agree, than committing another sexual crime?
- 10 A. Yes, inasmuch as you have to be charged. You could commit
- 11 a crime, and the Static-99 requires that you be charged with
- 12 that new crime.
- 13 Q. So you agree there's a difference in that definition
- 14 between the one you just gave, which is recidivism means
- 15 committing another sexual offense?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. That, I agree, is an important question, versus was he
- 18 | charged or convicted of doing it.
- 19 A. Yeah, sure.
- 20 Q. Two different things?
- 21 A. Of course.
- 22 Q. In fact, are you aware of the cases that have criticized
- 23 the Static-99 as saying -- for example, United States v.
- 24 McIlrath, 512 F.3d, 421 at 425, a Seventh Circuit case from
- 25 2008 that says, The Static-99 treats as a recidivist only

someone who is convicted of a further sex offense, but the 1 recidivism concern is with someone who commits a further 2 offense whether or not he is caught; yet if he is not caught, 3 4 his subsequent crime does not affect the data on which the Static-99 calibrations are based. Do you agree with that? 5 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. On Page 14 of your report, you reference the Static-99 and you say, Mr. Augusta's risk of sexual reoffense is moderately 8 9 high. Did you mean reoffense, or did you mean reconviction? A. I meant reoffense, the likelihood that he would do 10 another --11 12 Q. But the Static-99 is not validated for that, don't you 13 agree? A. Well, the sort of samples that are used to validate it 14 15 require this to come -- require crimes to come to some attention, and the only way they're going to come to attention 16 17 is if somebody has been arrested, charged, convicted, or whatever. That's in terms of validation of the Static-99. 18 My understanding of the use of this is that it can be 19 20 used to give the risk of recidivism. And recidivism is --21 would be for any sexual crime, not for -- if you're talking about an actual identified sexual crime, this would fall into 22 the sort of matter of validating the Static-99. 23

But in terms of its use in terms of predicting risk, I don't think that this -- the risk pertains to, I would say, in

24

Cross/Berry - Dr. Krueger

my use of it and understanding of it, to behavior, to criminal behavior, be it detected or not detected.

Q. But we just went over the Static-99 manual, and it defines recidivism as a new charge or conviction of a sex offense. And you're saying that you're going to use that basis to say he's an above average risk or a moderate risk to say he's actually going to rape again, and that's not what it does, does it?

A. I would disagree. I think that it gives you an estimation of the likelihood of recidivism, measured or not. The whole idea of measuring it or not is a separate question that contributes to the validation of the Static-99 or not.

Beyond that, there are these other instruments in this whole evaluation which result, in my opinion, in terms of risk, and that opinion about risk is not this narrowly defined risk of reoffense and getting caught at it, it's the -- his risk of doing this again. That's --

- Q. Which of the tools you used, Dr. Krueger, can we go and look at the manual and it says, this is validated for reoffense, meaning raping again, versus reconviction or recidivism as defined in the Static-99 and all these other tools? Which tool, Dr. Krueger, is about reoffense, not reconviction? Tell me.
- A. Again, these tools, that specific language is not going to be found in these various instruments, but if -- in the manuals of these various instruments. But SVR-20, these are -- this

- will give you a capacity to identify features that should be addressed in treatment. It doesn't say that this is going to
- be useful for identifying risk of some future measured sexual
- 4 crime.

- Q. Let me ask you this, Dr. Krueger. Would you agree to the
- 6 kid that's getting raped that what matters is whether he gets
- 7 raped, not whether the guy gets convicted?
- 8 A. Of course.
 - Q. What was your referral question in this case?
- 10 A. I was basically asked to do an assessment of Mr. Augusta
- 11 given these charges against him, given the -- I think he may
- 12 have pled by that point, but just to do an assessment which
- 13 would be a diagnostic and a risk assessment.
- 14 Q. Do you consider yourself biased for the defendant in this
- 15 case?
- 16 A. I'm hired by the defendant's attorney. I think that the
- 17 evaluation that I do is an objective one. I think that I've
- 18 had various defense attorneys fire me, basically, or not hire
- 19 me again, and I --
- 20 Q. Like Dr. Foley, I guess.
- 21 A. Well, he didn't hire me or fire me. I don't know about
- 22 | him. But, I mean, I think that I would have a duty as a
- 23 | forensic psychiatrist to protect the public, and I'm not going
- 24 to generate a report which is going to minimize somebody's
- 25 | risk. I mean, if he was a serious risk, I would so say it. I

- do this with respect to cases in New York, civil commitments and so on.
- 3 Q. What are your billable hours in this case?
- 4 A. How many are they?
 - Q. Yes, sir.
- 6 A. That would be, you know, maybe 20 or 40, probably,
- 7 ballpark, something like that.
- 8 Q. Twenty to forty?
- 9 A. Well, it's \$400 per hour times 40 hours, basically, I
- 10 think.

- 11 \blacksquare Q. And that includes the hour I'm keeping you here?
- 12 A. It includes today, sure.
- 13 Q. Okay. Percentage of your work that was for defense
- 14 mitigation in the last five years, give me that percentage.
- 15 **∥** A. I'm pretty much a hundred percent. No, I would say
- 16 | 95 percent. I just testified for the Attorney General in New
- 17 York.
- 18 Q. All right. Last year, percentage? The same because you
- 19 **∥** just testified?
- 20 A. Last year would be a hundred -- well, I --
- 21 | Q. That's close enough, Doctor. Ninety-five to a hundred
- 22 percent?
- 23 A. Yeah, correct.
- 24 Q. That's close enough. Thank you. Let's talk about the ACE
- 25 score that you reference in your report. There was some

- discussion about that between you and Ms. Freese. Do you
- 2 recall that discussion?
- 3 A. Sure.
- 4 MR. BERRY: I'd point the court to Paragraph 15 of the
- 5 doctor's report on Page 12 for this section. May I approach,
- 6 Your Honor?
- 7 THE COURT: Yes.
- 8 BY MR. BERRY:
- 9 Q. Dr. Krueger, I've handed you what's been marked as
- 10 Government's Exhibits 4 and 5. Do you see those?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Number 4 is what?
- 13 A. Number 4 is my scoring of the ACE.
- 14 MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United
- 15 | States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 4.
- 16 MS. FREESE: No objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Four is admitted.
- 18 BY MR. BERRY:
- 19 Q. What's Number 5?
- 20 A. Number 5 is a letter dated October 31st, 2014, to AUSA
- 21 Clancy from Daniel Myshin.
- 22 | Q. Keep going. Turn a couple pages. Do you recognize it
- 23 more?
- 24 A. It has a report appended of a Zachary Knight.
- 25 Q. Who wrote that report?

A. I did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 5.

MS. FREESE: Your Honor, until I have more information, I guess, on the purpose for the admission of this exhibit, I would object to it.

THE COURT: Sustained pending further explanation.

MR. BERRY: Sure.

BY MR. BERRY:

- Q. So in this report, this Knight, what I'm calling the Knight report, Exhibit 5, Doctor, did you also utilize the ACE scale on that subject?
- 13 A. Yes.

MR. BERRY: That's the relevance, Your Honor. It's for impeachment about his assertion in this case versus that one.

THE COURT: I'm not sure I get the connection. Who is this defendant, Zachary Knight?

MR. BERRY: Let me do it this way.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERRY: Let me try another way.

BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Dr. Krueger, in this case, you said Mr. Augusta had a score of six, quote, which is an extremely elevated score, the worst I have encountered in my experience, end quote, in your report

- 1 in this case. Correct?
 - A. Yes.

2

- Q. Tell me what you scored Mr. Knight.
- 4 A. Ten, ten out of ten.
- 5 Q. Ten out of ten, yet this is the worst you've ever seen,
- 6 except for the one you did recently that was seven, and that's
- 7 also now the worst one. Correct?
- 8 A. This would be the worst. My memory failed me. This would
- 9 be in 2014, yes.
- 10 MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United
- 11 States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 5.
- 12 MS. FREESE: I'd still object, Your Honor. I mean,
- 13 | it's offered for impeachment purposes. It's in the record. I
- 14 don't know that it's appropriate to enter the report in the
- 15 record.
- 16 MR. BERRY: You know what, it's actually okay with me,
- 17 Your Honor. Because it has some personal information, we would
- 18 probably want to redact everything except that paragraph. So
- 19 I've got in what I needed.
- 20 THE COURT: Okay.
- 21 MR. BERRY: I'm happy to not admit the exhibit itself.
- 22 The court has heard the testimony.
- 23 THE COURT: Okay.
- 24 BY MR. BERRY:
- 25 Q. You agree that that report makes this report inaccurate, at

best?

- A. Well, I would say that it makes my particular assertion

 about the ACE, the score on the ACE, it definitely indicates

 that I was erroneous in this assertion that this was the worst

 that I had seen. But I would take issue with applying that
- 6 error to the rest of the report.
- Q. Fair enough, Dr. Krueger. I was not implying that. I mean with respect to the ACE scale, when you make the rather
- 9 assertive statement this is the worst I have encountered in my
- 10 life at a six, except for my testimony earlier today about the
- 11 seven that I did recently and except for this report that you
- 12 did in this district three years ago that was a ten out of ten,
- 13 except for that, you agree that this is inaccurate on this
- 14 point. Correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. You also agree that -- in your report you say that many of
- 17 the diagnostic instruments that I have used have not been
- 18 validated using DSM-5 criteria. Correct?
- 19 A. I'm sorry, what's -- yes, correct, yes.
- 20 Q. You say that in your report here today. Correct?
- 21 | A. Um-hum.
- 22 Q. And the DSM-5 was published in 2013. Correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And you were part, as you testified earlier today, part of
- 25 the team of people that helped write the 5, the DSM-5, for

- 1 about five years. Correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. In fact, you have also advocated for greater tolerance of
- 4 pedophiles. Isn't that correct?
- 5 A. Yes, in a variety of venues, yes.
- 6 Q. You actually wrote a commentary called, quote, A Favorable
- 7 View of the DSM-IV Diagnosis of Pedophilia and Empathy for the
- 8 Pedophile. Correct?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And in that you said, quote, Overall, we have found that
- 11 individuals who are pedophiles have been and continue to be
- 12 subject to great condemnation and discrimination by society,
- 13 and any work that would enhance tolerance of them is most
- 14 | welcome. You wrote that. Correct?
- 15 A. Yes, sure.
- 16 | O. Let's talk about the Static-99 for a moment.
- 17 MR. BERRY: May I approach, Your Honor?
- 18 THE COURT: Yes.
- 19 BY MR. BERRY:
- 20 🛮 Q. I've handed you what's been marked as Government's Exhibit
- 21 6. Do you see that?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 \mathbb{Q} . What is it?
- 24 A. It's my scoring of the Static-99R.
- 25 MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United

1 States moves for the admission of Government's Exhibit 6.

THE COURT: Any objection to six, Ms. Freese?

MS. FREESE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Six is admitted.

MR. BERRY: May I publish?

THE COURT: Yes.

BY MR. BERRY:

Q. Now, when we look at this test, Dr. Krueger, when it talks about the risk factors, age at release, ever lived with, index nonsexual violence, all those things down through there, at no point -- and I think maybe the judge got at this earlier, the test does not account for the type of violence used by the

defendant, does it?

- A. It does not -- well, no, it would -- certainly it would inasmuch as there's an issue of index nonsexual violence or prior nonsexual violence. So this would actually be violence which is nonsexual. So it considers violence important, but not the type of sexual abuse.
- Q. So, for example, it doesn't account for the fact that he used a handle of a hammer up the anus of a six-year-old boy. It doesn't account for that, does it?
- A. That's correct. It does not -- the type of sexual abuse has not been identified as a risk factor.
- 24 MR. BERRY: Objection. Nonresponsive to the question.
 25 BY MR. BERRY:

- Q. Does it consider that fact, yes or no?
- 2 A. Well, I would say that one would have to look at the use of
- 3 violent implementation in the index crime and to that -- and
- 4 decide whether that was sexual or nonsexual.
- 5 Q. Right. But it doesn't talk about the type of violence
- 6 other than that binary question of sexual versus nonsexual. Do
- 7 | you agree with that?
- 8 A. Yes.

- 9 Q. It doesn't refer to slapping, punching, and hitting the boy
- 10 specifically. Correct?
- 11 A. Well, it would in the sense that if there are separate
- 12 charges for violence, such as a threat or use of a gun or
- 13 injury and so on, it would take that into account. Otherwise,
- 14 | it --
- 15 Q. Actually, it wouldn't, because you'd only get a one point
- 16 regardless. Correct?
- 17 A. Yes. But it -- if there's -- well, it would have to be
- 18 charged. I mean, if it's violence occurring as part of sexual
- 19 sadism, it would not count. If there's -- however the violence
- 20 ccurs, if it results in a separate nonsexual charge, separate
- 21 nonsexual charge of violence, then it would be -- then it would
- 22 count.
- 23 | Q. But just once?
- 24 A. You would just get a point on that, yes.
- 25 Q. You'd get a point for slapping, and you don't get an extra

- 1 point for using a handle of a hammer to sodomize him. Correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. And you don't get an extra point for using a knife against
- 4 | the throat of this boy, do you?
- 5 A. Correct, no.
- 6 Q. And you didn't make any note in your report about how the
- 7 Static-99 does not take into account the severity of the crime,
- 8 did you? Yes or no.
- 9 A. I did not. It's not part of the instrument.
- 10 | Q. You also failed to follow proper protocol by including a
- 11 statement as to whether you considered the score an accurate
- 12 representation of the offender's risk given the characteristics
- 13 | that were excluded from the 99. Isn't that correct?
- 14 A. I did not make such a statement.
- 15 \parallel Q. In fact, there's a new tally sheet that you didn't use.
- 16 | Correct?
- 17 A. That's correct, although I did regrade -- I used the new
- 18 | tally sheet subsequently as I reviewed for this. I don't have
- 19 | it before me, but I looked at the new tally sheet.
- 20 | Q. But you didn't provide it to us, did you?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 | Q. And in it, instead of calling it moderate or whatever you
- 23 called it, it actually calls him above average risk. Correct?
- 24 A. Yes, probably, yes.
- 25 Q. Now, with regards to Number 8 on the Static-99, do you see

where it says, Any unrelated victims?

A. Correct.

- Q. Why did you mark that as a no?
- A. Because at the time I understood that a victim had to be ——
 I understood that the victimization was of a picture of an
 unrelated victim, and you're not allowed to count pictures. It
 has to be an actual hands—on victim.

I subsequently have learned that apparently there is an image of him touching the 16-year-old -- 16-month-old individual, which would make it a hands-on crime, and thus I would add one point to the score.

- Q. In fact, you asked that very question of the defense -- because you knew it could influence the Static-99, you asked that back in July after you had interviewed him. Correct?
- A. Asked -- well, I'm not sure who I -- I may have -- I'm not sure who I asked. It could have been, it could have been a question to the attorneys. I'm not sure.
- Q. Your question on July 12th, 2017, to the defense team was, First, was -- you say "where," I think you mean "there" -- was there in the discovery or where in the discovery there is reference to Mr. Augusta's sexual abuse of an infant and was this ever charged separately? And if there was this additional child, was this child a relative? And then you say, The reason the first of the question above is important is that this information could influence his score on the Static-99.

- 1 Correct?
- 2 A. Sure.

- Q. When did you finally learn this?
- 4 A. When I obtained the presentence investigation, presentence
- 5 evaluation report from the -- it was just provided to me in the
- 6 past day or so, couple days.
- 7 Q. But you didn't proffer an addendum to your report saying,
- 8 whoops, I got that one wrong?
- 9 A. I have not, no.
- 10 | Q. I'd like to turn to the Hare psychopathy, the PCL-R for a
- 11 moment. It's already in evidence, so if we could go back to
- 12 it. It's Exhibit Number 1. You agree that the greater the
- 13 psychopathy rating, the higher the risk of being convicted of a
- 14 new sex crime. Correct?
- 15 **A.** Yes.
- 16 Q. You scored him at a 15 and said in your report that the
- 17 cutoff for psychopathy is 30. Correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Yes?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. In the report, you said, quote, This is an elevated score.
- 22 But you never said in your report that regardless of the
- 23 cutoff, the higher, the greater the risk. Correct?
- 24 A. I did not.
- 25 Q. In fact, you have said in the Cartegena case, in the

- 1 | transcript at Page 73, Lines 3 to 5, that, quote, There must be
- 2 a thousand peer-reviewed articles on it which shows the higher
- 3 the Hare score, the greater the risk of recidivism, end quote.
- 4 | Correct?
- 5 A. Yes.

- Q. Now, you didn't put that in your report, did you?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. By the way, what is the cutoff for psychopathy?
- 9 A. It's 30.
- 10 | Q. In the Punn transcript, on Page 47, at Lines 15 to 17, you
- 11 | testified that this particular defendant had a score of nine,
- 12 \parallel and that was well below the threshold of 25 or 30.
- 13 A. Well, I think, depending upon different articles, there's a
- 14 threshold of 25 or 30 for psychopathy.
- 15 | Q. Did you say 25 or 30 in Punn because that guy had nine, so
- 16 he was way off of it, but in this one, with 15, maybe we should
- 17 | push it up to 30, make him look further away? Is that why you
- 18 did that?
- 19 A. That was not my intention, no.
- 20 Q. Now, on the checklist, you mark it as -- we talked about
- 21 | this previously -- yes, no, or maybe. Correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And you never said in your report that you marked this guy
- 24 | a maybe nine times. Nine times you put him on the bubble.
- 25 Right?

- A. Okay, sure.
- Q. Now, you agree that, as we talked about earlier, another
- 3 | rater could look at this, and your maybe could be a yes or a no
- 4 for that rater. Do you agree with that?
- 5 A. Yes.

- 6 Q. It would not be unreasonable for another rater to look at
- 7 | this and mark him, let's say, one off of you. Correct?
- 8 A. Yes. Again, it would depend upon the qualifications and
- 9 training of the rater.
- 10 Q. Of course. So on each of these maybes, another rater could
- 11 | call them a yes. Right? That would raise him from a 15 to a
- 12 24. Do you agree with that math?
- 13 A. Yes. I mean, any of these another rater could disagree.
- 14 | Q. In fact, you didn't have a second person rate this guy, did
- 15 you?
- 16 A. I did not.
- 17 | Q. And, in fact, the Hare organization, the website itself
- 18 | talks about how, quote, We further recommend that wherever
- 19 possible, the PCL-R scores of two independent raters should be
- 20 averaged. But you didn't do that, did you?
- 21 A. I did not.
- 22 Q. So another one could have rated him a 24 or maybe even a
- 23 29, and we'd have to average those two scores. Do you agree
- 24 with that?
- 25 A. Well, I think that one could have -- you could have another

- 1 individual rate. I think that there have been studies that
- 2 show that on average, there's a five- or six-point discrepancy
- 3 between defense experts who rate the Hare and prosecution
- 4 experts. And this is --
- 5 Q. What we call the partisan allegiance effect. Correct?
- 6 A. I'm not sure what it's called. That nomenclature makes
- 7 sense. But this is well described.
- 8 Q. How would you rate yourself in terms of compassion and
- 9 mempathy, so to speak?
- 10 A. I think I'm compassionate. I think I'm empathic.
- 11 | Q. Are you familiar with the study that says that if the
- 12 | rater, in this case you, scores high on a couple of factors,
- 13 compassion and empathy being one of them, that they are less
- 14 likely to score an individual closer to the psychopathy,
- 15 **∥** psychopathic threshold? Are you familiar with that study?
- 16 \blacksquare A. I'm not aware of that particular study.
- 17 Q. Does it surprise you?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 | Q. If you would, please, look at Government's Exhibit 3
- 20 | already in evidence. It's the SONAR, Dr. Krueger.
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. On your screen, I've highlighted a portion. Do you see
- 23 | that there? It says, It is possible.
- 24 A. Sure.
- 25 Q. And it says, It is possible that the dynamic factors

- 1 | identified in the current study may be more important for
- 2 determining the timing of reoffending than for determining
- 3 which offenders will eventually recidivate given long followup
- 4 periods. Do you agree with that, that it says that?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Sorry, I didn't mean to take that off the screen. You
- 7 didn't put that in your report about the predictive accuracy or
- 8 the utility of the SONAR, did you?
- 9 A. I did not.
- 10 | Q. You also talk a lot about Mr. Augusta being a victim
- 11 | himself. Correct?
- 12 A. I don't know a lot about it, but I mention it.
- 13 Q. Fair enough. I gave a subjective term there. I appreciate
- 14 you biting into it. You agree, though, don't you, that a
- 15 | history of being a victim actually increases a person's risk of
- 16 recidivism? Correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. You've testified to that fact before. Isn't that right?
- 19 A. I may have. I'm not quite -- I don't recall exactly when,
- 20 | but --
- 21 | Q. Do you know what the MacDonald Triad is?
- 22 A. I do not.
- 23 Q. The set of three factors that when two are present, they
- 24 tend to predict later violent tendencies, like, for example,
- 25 | homicidal -- serial killers, things like that. You're not

- 1 | familiar with that?
 - A. No.

2

- Q. Did you read the Foley report on Page 3 where it documents
- 4 | two of those factors? What is enuresis? What does that mean?
 - A. That means urinating at night, basically.
- 6 Q. And it says that he wet the bed until the age of 12 or 13,
- 7 and it also says he was engaged in fire-starting from the age
- 8 of nine to early adolescence. You didn't mention any of that
- 9 in your report, did you?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 | Q. And are you not familiar with the fact that those factors
- 12 are considered important when people assess the dangerousness
- 13 of an individual?
- 14 A. Well, I think -- now that I -- that particular term doesn't
- 15 | ring a bell, but I would say these three factors do, when
- 16 | there's been substantial literature, I think earlier literature
- 17 | supporting this and subsequent literature saying that this is
- 18 not so important or predictive. That's my general
- 19 recollection.
- 20 | Q. But you didn't mention any of it in your report. Right?
- 21 A. I did not, I did not.
- 22 | Q. You also did not mention in your report that in one of his
- 23 psych evals when he was 12, that he got so enraged at a
- 24 | 12-year-old girl at a YMCA pool that he pulled her under and
- 25 nearly drowned her. You didn't note that, did you?

- A. I did not.
- 2 Q. Now, you talk about treatment in this case and say he has a
- 3 good prognosis. But you agree that it's very difficult to
- 4 treat someone with a fixated pattern of deviant behavior.
- 5 | Correct?

1

- 6 A. I'm not sure I would characterize the -- I would use
- 7 | "very." I think that it's -- it's challenging to treat
- 8 somebody with a pattern of deviant behavior.
- 9 Q. In the Cartegena transcript, on Page 101 at Lines 18 to 22,
- 10 you said, quote, The research does not well distinguish between
- 11 treating pedophilia and treating other sexual deviant behavior.
- 12 I think available research would suggest that if somebody has a
- 13 | fixated pattern of sexual deviance, it's hard to treat, much,
- 14 much harder to treat.
- 15 A. Yeah, I would agree.
- 16 Q. You never stated in your report that someone like Augusta
- 17 is the kind of person that is much, much harder to treat, you
- 18 | just said, good prognosis for treatment. Correct?
- 19 A. I'm not sure I would -- that's a simple -- that's a
- 20 conclusory remark. I think I said that he had a good
- 21 prognosis, and I would say, perhaps, he's bright, motivated, an
- 22 excellent candidate for therapy.
- 23 Q. You say, quote, He's an excellent candidate for therapy and
- 24 sex offender-specific therapy and, in my judgment, has a good
- 25 prognosis for treatment. Correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. But nowhere in the report did you talk about the studies that show that treatment is largely ineffective for these people, did you?
 - A. Well, I did not. I would say that there's some controversy regarding that assertion that treatment is largely ineffective.

 I mean, there have been some large studies which have been disappointing, but there are also some other studies of an analytic nature that show that treatment is effective.

And there are certainly many, a variety of other studies, one of which I provided in terms of this New England Journal of Medicine article, which show that an open design is very effective, it's just a matter that there's not funding or a history that has allowed for large-scale, scientifically valid studies.

- Q. In the Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Paraphilias, an article you wrote in the Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Science in 2012, you said -- you summarized some studies and said, Although recidivism was low initially, relapse rates continue to rise even ten years after treatment. Do you remember writing that?
- A. I wrote that article. I don't know exactly what I was referring to, but I do not dispute that I wrote that.
- Q. In another -- in the same article later on you're summarizing another series of empirical studies, meta-analysis,

- 1 and you summarize and you say, They concluded that, quote,
- 2 there is, as yet, no evidence that clinical treatment reduces
- 3 rates of sex offense in general and no appropriate data for
- 4 assessing whether it may be differentially effective for
- 5 different types of offenders. You wrote that, too, didn't you?
- 6 A. Yes, I would stick by that basically.
- 7 Q. In the same article you also said, quote, Evaluation of
- 8 recidivism has proven extremely difficult, in part due to
- 9 underreporting of sexual crimes. Does that sound about right?
- 10 A. Sure.
- 11 | Q. And that goes back to our issue about what does recidivism
- 12 mean. Right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | 0. Reoffense versus reconviction. Correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. You also don't mention in your report that in Dr. Foley's
- 17 report, he documented that Augusta told him that when he was in
- 18 | a psychiatric hospital in 2007, that he, quote, conformed to
- 19 hospital expectations, quote, to get out of the facility, end
- 20 quote. You didn't include that in your report either, did you?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. And you agree that having been abused himself does not mean
- 23 that was the cause of Mr. Augusta abusing Victim 1 or any of
- 24 | the other victims. You agree with that. Right?
- 25 A. Of course, yes.

- 1 Q. Causation is not -- correlation is not causation. Correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- 3 Q. In fact, you wrote in a letter in 2011 to the Archives of
- 4 Sexual Behavior that, quote, The psychiatric -- or, excuse me,
- 5 The psychiatric community, quote, currently lacks sufficient
- 6 science to establish the etiology for many psychiatric
- 7 disorders, end quote. What does "etiology" mean?
- 8 A. Etiology.
- 9 Q. Thank you.
- 10 A. The origin, the etiology, the cause, the sort of origins of
- 11 psychiatric disturbance.
- 12 Q. In all of the things that you listed in your report that
- 13 you reviewed, the 20-odd things, none of them were the
- 14 contraband in this case. Right? You did not review the
- 15 contraband. Isn't that correct?
- 16 A. By "contraband," you mean video images or pornography? I
- 17 did not, no.
- 18 Q. You've done that in other cases, though, haven't you?
- 19 A. Sure.
- 20 Q. In fact, you have testified before, specifically in the
- 21 Cartegena case again, at Page 7, Lines 20 to 25, you said,
- 22 Certainly self-report is one element of evidence. There are
- 23 other elements which we would rely upon, including the
- 24 | evidentiary record of discovery, which we talked about, and
- 25 particularly useful is what a hard-drive analysis might

contain. But yet you didn't look at anything from the hard drive in this case. Correct?

A. Correct.

Q. You didn't look at the images from March 10th, 2013, to
March 31st, 2013, that were still images of the defendant
engaging in sexual behavior with Victim 1, his mother, the
adolescent sister, and the adolescent brother, who were not
charged in this case? You didn't look at those. Right?

A. I did not. I would say that in the past, you know, before
10 or 15 years ago, it was the case that such images were

allowed to be distributed by defense attorneys.

Subsequently, there were various rulings that made these images basically contraband, so that in order to review them, one had to actually go into the vaults of the FBI or wherever and view these, and I did not do that in this circumstance.

I certainly will if it's sort of feasible. I think that the available resources did not allow this, and I'm able to, on the basis of what was described, make an opinion. I don't have to see -- I mean, I will always want and solicit as much information as I can, but I don't always have to see images to make an opinion.

Q. And you talk about how the law has changed over time, but it's been the same since 2011 when you were in the Cartegena case in the Eastern District of New York and 2015 in the Punn

case, and both of those you reviewed the images. Correct?

A. Yes.

MR. BERRY: At this time, Your Honor, the United States would like to play for Dr. Krueger a compilation of the contraband in this case and ask him some followup questions regarding his opinion and whether it's affected.

It's about 12 minutes long. It is culled from 49 minutes of video and audio. For example, the nine-minute audio we played in the Stamm case, Your Honor, pulled out a section of that. I've tried to truncate it as much as possible. It is just under 12 minutes. I plan to just play it and then end with a couple of followup questions, and then I'll be done.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to ask that you not play the videos or audio segments on the screen that is in the gallery or on any other screen in the courtroom, save the witness's and the defense attorneys.

MR. BERRY: That's fine with me. If the court can help me with that, I'm fine with that, as well.

So what I'm going to do, Your Honor, because I'm looking at my laptop, I'm going to start it playing and then I will try to tilt the screen down so that the audience doesn't see that, as well. Maybe a juror's monitor would be a good idea for the defense attorney.

THE COURT: That would be fine.

BY MR. BERRY:

- 1 Q. Dr. Krueger, do you have it on your monitor right now?
- 2 A. No, the monitor is blank.
- 3 Q. Okay.
- 4 A. Okay, now, sure.
- 5 Q. Do you see it? It says, U.S. v. Augusta, Compilation of
- 6 Photos and Videos from March 10, 2013, to July 22nd, 2015?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Thank you.
- 9 MR. BERRY: And most of this doesn't have sound.
- 10 Occasionally something has sound. So if it had sound, I left
- 11 | it in, Your Honor. If it didn't, it's not there. I'm not
- 12 redacting one way or another. So there's some silence for a
- 13 | couple of minutes, and then sound will jump in. I don't mean
- 14 | that to alarm anyone. It's just the way it's cut together.
- 15 I'll start now.
- 16 (Video/audio recording played.)
- 17 BY MR. BERRY:
- 18 Q. I'm going to pause it for just a second. Can you hear that
- 19 okay?
- 20 A. Sure, I can hear it. I just wondered if there were images
- 21 associated with it, which I didn't see.
- 22 | Q. It's just the audio. That's why the sign is in the
- 23 middle --
- 24 A. Sure.
- 25 Q. -- to signify that.

MR. BERRY: Continue. 1 2 (Video/audio recording played.) BY MR. BERRY: 3 That's it, Dr. Krueger. Now, having seen that, does it 4 change your opinion at all about whether this man can be 5 6 managed safely in the community today? 7 It does not. Α. MR. BERRY: No further questions. 8 THE COURT: Any questions, Ms. Freese? 9 MS. FREESE: Your Honor, just briefly in a couple of 10 areas. Nothing at length. 11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MS. FREESE: 13 14 Dr. Krueger, how long have you been a doctor? 15 Since 1977, 40 years. Okay. So the government just asked you a number of 16 17 questions about bias, and because we didn't go through all of 18 your qualifications based upon their agreement to them, 19 throughout your career, have you had periods where you've 20 testified on behalf of the state or the government? 21 A. Yes, sure. 22 And just briefly, when were some of those times? 23 When I was in Massachusetts before I moved to New York, I 24 did evaluations in their sort of civil commitment program. 25 must have done a hundred evaluations and was called to testify,

- depending upon the result of the evaluation, by defense or --1 2 by the defense or the prosecution. It was roughly 50/50 at that time.
- Subsequently, I actually did a number of cases for the 4 5 Office of Professional and Medical Conduct that I testified for 6 the prosecution. And also I guess more recently there was a --7 this year there was a case in which I testified for the Attorney General in terms of the admissibility of a 8 9 psychiatric -- of a pedophilia diagnosis.
- Q. And are your professional opinions driven by who hires you? 10 Do you shape them depending upon who is hiring you? 11
- 12 Α. No.

3

- 13 Q. And all of the opinions that you've offered throughout the course of your testimony, you offer them to a reasonable degree 14 15 of psychiatric certainty?
 - A. Yes.

16

- 17 Now, currently your employment, you work in the treatment 18 of sex offenders. Correct?
- 19 The assessment and treatment of sex offenders, yes. Α.
- And that is at least on a part-time basis for the State of 20 New York? 21
- It's on a full-time, it's a four-day-a-week, it's 22
- 80 percent of my time. So this is what I've done 15, 20 years 23 24 full time, 80 percent of my time.
- 25 And I really just want to talk to you about three of the

- tests. Based upon -- are any of your opinions, and I'm not talking about factual discrepancies, but are any of your opinions that you rendered in your report changed at all?
- 4 A. No.
- Q. With respect to the Static-99, you and I had a number of discussions about the other victims. Some were charged, some were uncharged. Is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And specifically, Government's Exhibit Number -- my
 10 apologies. Well, your scoring sheet of the Static-99, which is
 11 Government's Exhibit Number 6, specifically talks about other
 12 victims. Right?
- 13 A. Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And if you change that score to reflect what you now know, explain how that impacts your opinion, if at all, with respect to his moderate to high risk conclusion.
 - A. So according to this, let's say there's an unrelated victim, you would increase the score of three -- to three or to five. Three would put it still at a low moderate category. Five would be in the moderate high category. It would not alter the location of this according to this older scoring sheet.

According to the new one, I think it would place you in an average -- it would be an above average risk. And if one looks at a contemporary application, if one waits 30 years, it

would put him in a, I think, below average risk.

I don't have the page before me, but the scores would not change, just the sort of interpretation would. And I think that he would be -- the older he is, the more he would fall into an average category.

- Q. And with respect to the ACE test, you were actually asked about another case in this district and some of your other conclusions you've reached. How many times have you administered the ACE test, if you can ballpark?
- 10 A. I would say, over the past four, five years, maybe a hundred times.
- Q. Okay. And in your report, you indicated that it was, I think you did specifically say the worst that you've encountered --
- 15 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

- Q. -- in your experience.
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. But we know that in another case there was a higher score, and that was before you rendered that opinion. Correct?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So given that fact and we know that it's now not the worst, how would you categorize it in terms of the over one hundred evaluations that you have done?
- 24 A. It's among the worst.
- 25 Q. Among the worst?

- A. Among the worst.
- 2 Q. And just so that we're clear, that score of a seven which
- 3 you testified to on direct examination was done after you
- 4 rendered your opinion in this matter?
- 5 A. Yes.

1

- Q. Okay. And is the six out of ten, if it's among the worst,
- 7 still significantly elevated?
- 8 A. Yeah, sure.
- 9 Q. And sort of my final subset of questions are just about the
- 10 Hare report. You were asked a number of questions about that,
- 11 particularly the cutoff. And explain the cutoff between -- the
- 12 difference between 25 and 30 and the difference in the
- 13 | literature, and then my second followup question would be, is
- 14 | that significant here?
- 15 | A. Okay. I mean, I think that -- again, I -- there were
- 16 different sources for the two numbers. I can't cite them
- 17 | exactly. The manual may state 30. But if somebody is on the
- 18 margin -- I mean, the issue is whether somebody makes a
- 19 threshold criteria for psychopathy.
- 20 That diagnosis or that entity is used, let's say, in
- 21 the SVR-20, and I think otherwise it has a certain
- 22 | significance. The fact that Mr. Augusta had a score of, I
- 23 | think, 15 places him well below the psychopathic threshold, so
- 24 | to speak, for these purposes. I mean, even if you concede I'm
- 25 four or five points off or six or seven, he still doesn't make

that threshold. 1 Q. And I think you indicated on cross-examination that some of 2 the literature would indicate the difference between a 3 prosecution and defense evaluation could be as much as five or 4 six points. Is that right? 5 Yes, that's my recollection. 6 7 Q. Okay. So if we would add -- let's add six. If we would add six points to your score of 15, he'd still be under the 25. 8 9 Correct? A. Yes. 10 MS. FREESE: One moment, Your Honor. Your Honor, I 11 12 have no additional questions for Dr. Krueger. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Anything else? MR. BERRY: No, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Dr. Krueger, I meant to ask you earlier, have you ever testified before Congress or the Sentencing 16 17 Commission about these matters? THE WITNESS: I haven't. It sort of came to me -- I 18 19 became aware of this sort of after an initial request. I have 20 testified before the New York -- committees in New York State. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 22 THE WITNESS: Sure. THE COURT: You may step down. Counsel, I have a 23 24 telephone call regarding a trial matter that's scheduled for 25 Monday. It should just take a few minutes. So I'm going to

```
give you a ten-minute recess here so that we can take up that
1
     matter. It should be very brief. It's really just a
2
3
     scheduling call. Okay?
              MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor.
4
              THE COURT: We'll be in recess.
5
 6
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court is in recess.
7
         (Recess taken.)
              THE COURT: Ms. Freese.
8
9
              MS. FREESE: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
     concludes our testimony for the day. At this point we have
10
     three witnesses in the courtroom who would like to offer
11
12
     remarks as opposed to testimony on behalf of my client.
13
              THE COURT: All right.
              MS. FREESE: First would be Cheryl Parsons. And, Your
14
15
     Honor, where would you like Ms. Parsons to stand? At the
     podium?
16
17
              THE COURT: I would ask counsel for the government
     whether they wish to have them sworn as witnesses, or are they
18
19
     character witnesses? I'm not sure what you've worked out.
20
              MR. BERRY: Your Honor, if the court is inclined to
21
     ask questions, I'd like them to be sworn. To the extent that
22
     they're just offering a statement, a character statement on his
     behalf, I'm happy to expedite this along.
23
24
              THE COURT: All right. So the podium is fine.
25
              MS. FREESE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
```

THE WITNESS: My name is Cheryl Parsons. It's spelled C-h-e-r-y-l, Parsons with an "s" on the end.

I am a retired teacher from Carlisle High School where I taught from 1977 until 2012. I directed three choirs at the high school, taught music theory and theater experiences, initiated and was the faculty adviser for the extracurricular show choir, and I codirected the high school musical.

I first met William, who I knew as Will Hunter, when he was in ninth grade in the fall of 2010. His middle school music teacher, Mrs. Fry, who served as our rehearsal accompanist for the high school musical, had encouraged him to audition for our 2011 production of Titanic.

As I recall, Will waited until near the end of the auditions to sing and read for the audition. He came across as very self-conscious, and his body language clearly registered with me as someone who was more than ordinarily fearful. His posture was drawn in, he didn't make eye contact easily, and maintained an unusually wide spatial distance between himself and anyone else, including Mrs. Fry, who he knew well.

Although the audition procedure included a group dance audition in which most students signed up for a time slot that enabled them to learn and perform the dance combination with friends, it was evident that Will was there without the benefit of support from peers. Will had to be coaxed to sing, and we discovered, to our surprise, that he has a solo quality voice,

albeit an untrained one at that time.

His reading of text, although not that of an experienced actor, was fluent with accurate pronunciation, a varied inflection, and word emphasis that indicated he had good comprehension of the text.

Because Titanic had 24 male roles of various sizes, we cast him in a minor role that had a few brief lines of solo singing. This was a bit out of the ordinary since we had no previous history with Will or could not know how dependable he might be.

Once we got into rehearsal, we learned that Will was reliable and consistently present on days that he was needed and clearly aimed to please, although he was rarely satisfied with his own performance.

During rehearsal, he gradually lost most of his distrust of others, although I can't recall whether he made any close friends during his first musical of his high school career.

I do recall that during demanding dance rehearsals, some of the students distanced themselves from Will because of a perceived unpleasant body odor. If I recall accurately, the codirector of the musical, who was a male teacher, spoke with Will about personal hygiene, and I believe he was gradually more accepted into the musical family afterward.

Close to performance time it became clear that another

young man with a slightly larger role became academically ineligible to perform. By this time, we thought highly enough of Will to ask him to assume the larger role, which required more line memorization and more solo singing to be learned pretty much in the eleventh hour.

Will rose to the challenge and performed with confidence and complete accuracy. I distinctly remember a conversation I had with the high school principal on the day after he had attended one of the performances. This was the principal's first year at the high school. Having been the middle school principal at the school Will had attended the previous year, the principal exclaimed in utter surprise, what have you done with Will Hunter? He is such a different person than he was in middle school.

I had not been aware of any back history with regard to Will, so I was taken aback by his remark. I attributed the change to the power of music and theater to bring out the best in people and to bond performers together and never did find out any particulars at that time about Will's middle school experiences.

Because Will was making such great strides and because high school boys with talent who will prioritize choral singing are in short supply, I asked Will to audition for the high school's most select choral ensemble which met five days a week for 50 minutes a day, the Carlisle High School Chamber Singers.

It was a graded class with full academic weight.

He did audition, and he was a very strong tenor during my final year of teaching before retirement, which was his sophomore year. Because he went right into Chamber Singers, Will had missed the beginning level choir's strong emphasis on learning how to read music and sight-sing.

Regardless of that, I encouraged him to participate in an extracurricular activity that was open mostly just to the Chamber Singers, the Cumberland County Choral Festival, which was an extracurricular commitment to learning 12 additional pieces of music and attending several countywide rehearsals at other schools.

Most of the students who had participated in the county festival, including Will, also auditioned for district chorus, which is a two-day festival that is very competitive. Generally about 800 students audition to be in that chorus, which is 200 students. Students from seven counties are judged in rather rigorous two rounds of auditions to select the top 25 singers in each voice part.

I held rehearsals over the summer preceding these auditions and after school to prepare the students for these festivals. Will was very reliable in attending rehearsals, and because his music reading skills were not as advanced as the others, he often asked for extra help, staying for an extra 30 to 40 minutes for some individual instruction. Again, he

tended to be very self-critical, never quite satisfied with his progress, even though it was significant.

Once accepted, the district singers needed to learn an additional seven selections in order to audition for the prestigious regional chorus. Ultimately Will represented Carlisle High School quite well both at the county and the district level.

And my memory is a bit hazy as to whether he actually succeeded in going on to regional chorus or not, although I remember expecting him to achieve regional chorus the following year and was disappointed that he did not.

During his sophomore year, Will was much more accepted into the family circle atmosphere of choir students that I strove to make accessible to everyone. I do recall some occasions when he was very quiet and withdrawn causing a couple students to suggest that he didn't care about the success of the Chamber Singers. In retrospect, it's easy for me to understand that he was probably going through some tough times at home.

Because the choir took a multiple-day field trip to

New York City each spring involving quite a few fundraising

projects in which parents participated, I usually became

acquainted with parents and siblings of most of my students.

never remember meeting Will's family at meetings or following

concerts when we sometimes have receptions for the singers and

their families.

1.3

Will participated in the musical again during his tenth-grade year, this time singing in a barber shop quartet and having a speaking part in Bye-Bye Birdie. During the last week of rehearsal and following performances, rehearsals went quite late into the evening. Will didn't drive at the time and never had a parent come to pick him up. Sometimes late was after 11 o'clock at night.

On a number of occasions, when the weather was bad, I drove him home. Again, I never met family after the productions, even though Will did talk about needing to be responsible for his brother and sisters from -- or brothers and sister from time to time. He often voluntarily stayed late to assist with cleaning up the guy's dressing room, which was even messier than anyone can imagine. In retrospect, it now seems clear to me that Will was not eager to go back home.

The year after I retired, Will contacted me several times to assist him with learning his district chorus tryout selections, as the new choral teacher did not schedule very much rehearsal time believing that students needed to be strong enough music readers to learn the music on their own.

During this time and again during his senior year when Will was auditioning for a music education major at Mansfield University, he came to my home to get assistance. At no time when I was alone with Will late at night at school cleaning up

or taking him home in my car or when he came to my home music studio did I ever feel afraid of him or sense that he was anything other than a young man wanting to make the most of his potential.

Although I was aware that he lived with his mother, grandmother, and siblings, it seemed like the family was stretched for money. I knew that his mother had respectable jobs. I was not aware that she had graduated from college. I never heard mention of Will's father.

I direct a community choir in Carlisle that gives four concert performances each year, and it was my practice to offer Carlisle High School choir students free admission to the concert in return for their help in handing out programs.

Over the course of his sophomore, junior, and senior years, Will almost always volunteered and always showed up when he said he would, unlike some of the other students who were less reliable. He always dressed appropriately and interacted with the public in a pleasant and welcoming manner. He clearly enjoyed staying for the concerts to hear the advanced repertoire that the choir performs.

Sometimes when the concerts were held at venues far from his home, Will would walk quite a long distance in order to volunteer. He would often share his reactions to the concert repertoire with me afterwards and made very astute observations about the variety of musical styles represented.

When I learned of Will's arrest and alleged crimes, I was completely stunned, and based on their comments on FaceBook, his friends from the school choral program were equally surprised. I know from talking with several of them that the teachers at the high school were in total disbelief, as well.

I had always experienced him as a gentle soul and had never witnessed any action or gesture that was in any way threatening or violent. The only anger I had ever seen was frustration with himself. Compared to most other students, his level of gratitude and manner of expressing it was very sincere and mature.

I have been corresponding several times a month with Will for nearly two years, and I believe that he has been increasingly open with me. I have no reason to believe that he has been dishonest. I visited him several times at the Cumberland County Prison and once when he was at Camp Hill.

I have also spoken with his grandmother on the phone probably at least four times. And I think it's important to note that she allowed me to come to her home twice, once last winter and once slightly less than two weeks ago when I was preparing these remarks and I wanted to corroborate the things that I was saying that Will had told me.

She has validated many of the incidents in Will's family history that he wrote or spoke about to me. His

grandmother is 90 years old. She lives in her own home on Regal View in North Middleton Township. Her niece now lives with her. I found her to be coherent. She walks with a cane. She maintains her personal hygiene well and looks remarkably young for somebody who is 90 years old.

She would answer lots of my questions and tell me some personal stories. She was not willing to offer a lot of her own personal experience. But here are some things that I learned that lead me to feel that Will is truly a good person at heart, one that was a victim of abuse himself, someone who made some bad decisions when under tremendous stress, and someone who, in my opinion, is not ultimately a danger to society.

Will has told me and his grandmother has confirmed to me that his father violently beat him and his mother. He felt that he was lucky to have survived some of the abuse. It wasn't until today that I learned that his mother also was violent with him.

Will's grandmother indicated to me on two different occasions that at birth Will had problems that necessitated multiple tubes in his head and kept him at the hospital for two weeks, even though Will was not a premature baby.

Will's father seldom, if ever, lived with the family, failed to provide for the family, in his grandmother's words, never put a roof over their head, and was imprisoned more than

1.3

once, possibly, although I can't confirm this, this is what the grandmother thought, for drug possession or dealing.

The seven-year age difference between Will and his next youngest sibling provided enough time for Will to view himself as his mother's protector, and his grandmother corroborated that.

Will's father treated him dramatically different than his brothers and sister. On one occasion at a family reunion, his grandmother remembers Will's father making Will change his seat to sit alone at a distance from the rest of the family during the meal. Will's grandmother had nothing good to say about Will's father and at one point had been threatened by him herself.

Will's most trusted relationship was with his grandfather, whose death in 2001 had a significant negative effect on Will. Will's grandmother told me that she believes strongly that had his grandfather lived as long as she has, Will would not be in trouble today.

Will was expected to keep quiet about the abuse that was occurring, to cover up his own bruises and scars, and according to him, he was sometimes blamed for things he didn't do, but he didn't speak up in order to preserve the family's reputation.

He wrote me that he kept quiet out of fear, and these are his direct words, "fear of getting beat, fear of getting my

mom beat up, fear of getting my grandmother in trouble or hurt, fear of getting taken out of the home or having my siblings removed from the home, fear of being hospitalized, fear that no one would believe me, fear of making something out of nothing, so many things that simply boil down to the fact that I was young and scared."

Will lived in Carlisle, Harrisburg, and York and then back to Carlisle. He attended many different schools. His grandmother and I were trying to tally them up, and I think there were at least seven. And he did not develop many friendships. He was sometimes bullied and picked on and was sometimes scapegoated for standing up for himself.

I only was aware of one instance of bullying in my class at the high school when one of the young men in choir hid Will's jacket. It was on a day when Will was staying at school throughout the day into an evening rehearsal and needed to walk home when the weather was cold and wet after dark.

I didn't discover the prank until the evening of rehearsal was over and didn't learn what had happened to the jacket until much later. We were lucky that there was a hooded sweatshirt in the lost and found in my room that fit Will so that he didn't need to face the weather without a jacket, and I think I may ultimately have taken him home that night.

Will says he learned early on in life to detach himself from the family drama as a defense mechanism. He has

also told me that he entertained himself at various times in middle school and sometimes in high school by exploring chat rooms on the Internet. He said that he was curious about what made these people tick.

Will's Internet activity was not monitored at home. His grandmother was retired when Will was in high school so was at home most of the time. She only remembers two or three times when he had any friends come over to the house. These friends were, in all cases, girls and on a couple of the occasions were on prom night.

Will attended the prom at Carlisle High School as a sophomore, a junior, and as a senior. As a sophomore, he was not really eligible to attend unless he had been asked by an upperclassman, and that was what happened the first time, a girl in the class ahead of him asked him to go to the prom. Two of his prom dates I know were girls from the choir at high school.

According to his grandmother, Will frequently cooked dinner for the family, and they sat down together to eat it most nights. Will volunteered at Victory Circle and at Project SHARE in Carlisle. These are nonprofit organizations to help the underserved. He was active in the Educational Theater of Carlisle, in addition to his many musical activities.

Will had high hopes of graduating from college and attended Mansfield University for a probationary summer term

that immediately followed his high school graduation. He had a grade point average of 3.767 that term.

When his mother suffered severe health problems as a result of seizures in November of Will's freshman year in college, he took a break from college to take charge of her medical decisions and care and ultimately to find two jobs that enabled him to support the family when she had a second round of seizures that have left her brain damaged and permanently in a rehab hospital.

Her grandmother -- or his grandmother has visited his mother at the rehab facility in Mechanicsburg and corroborates that she cannot speak, that they actually can get her dressed and sit her up in her chair, and she's not sure whether her daughter recognizes her or not.

At age 19, he was responsible for making decisions that would save his mother's life and for supporting a family of five. He was working 60-plus hours a week seven days a week, working two jobs, one at Amazon and one in the evenings and weekends at the Motel 6. And he still was trying to handle some coursework from school at home, which ultimately had to be abandoned.

Will had assumed more responsibility than most young people from a very young age. He was accustomed to working hard to make his family situation as good as possible. He didn't have much practice in asking for help. He told me that

his father encouraged him to take advantage of public assistance, but that he had seen his father irresponsibly use the system and he didn't want to be like that.

It was during this time that Will couldn't handle stress well, and I'm not sure how much it coincides with the videos that we have seen or were shown today, but I know that it led to a chain of bad decisions. He seemed, when writing to me about it, confused about how it really did actually all happen, and he was either not able or possibly too embarrassed to explain it clearly to me.

From the things he wrote me, it seemed obvious that he was trying to please the older men with whom he communicated on the Internet and was not particularly interested in child pornography for its own sake.

When I started writing to Will, he hadn't heard from anyone in his family since his arrest. It was obvious to me that what mattered to him more than anything else was to get news of his mother's condition and to know whether his grandmother and siblings were all right.

I know Will as a caring young man. I now understand that he endured many hardships and, as a result, had developed coping mechanisms that are hard to understand through the average person's eyes.

But through it all, he kept trying to bounce back. He liked to be active, and he liked to help others. He was

1.3

polite, kind, and considerate when he wasn't dealing with depression or having a hard time living up to his own expectations. He is resilient and much of the time is hopeful of making a better life for himself.

During the 20 months that we have been corresponding, he has sent me letters of gratitude and well wishes on Mother's Day and on my birthday, a day that usually fell right after the choir's spring concerts, something the choir students had a long tradition of singing to me and giving me cards.

I have also received letters from him that reflect hopelessness and depression when he has felt abandoned by the many people he tried to help over the years or when his public defenders were so overloaded that he couldn't communicate with them regularly and wasn't sure he would be adequately represented.

Will has always been an achiever. Even in prison,
Will has sought to improve himself. He reads frequently and
writes daily. He started writing a novel for an inmate writing
contest. He has been very pleased when he has been approved to
hold a job, and he says that he tries to exercise whenever his
job permits.

I send him music theory exercises when I write to him, which he looks forward to receiving. He doesn't tolerate sitting around and doing nothing very well. He is a creative person and unfortunately found about the worst possible vehicle

for demonstrating his creativity.

Will recently wrote me that he had summoned up the courage to request a test for HIV. He said that he had not known that Ira Task was HIV-positive until after he was arrested. He was very relieved to discover that his test came out negative.

I do not believe that Will is a danger to society. I am deeply saddened that he hid his history of being abused so well. Because his father was so seldom mentioned and because Will is such a big guy, it never occurred to those of us in a position to report abuse that he was a victim. Had his history been known, he could have received the help that he needed that would have prevented this horrible situation.

I hope that justice and mercy can combine in determining this young man's future and that Will can receive help and support. He has so much potential for good. I know that he is not blameless, but I also know that he was influenced by older adults who were manipulating a curious and susceptible young person who had few adults that showed an interest in him and whom he could trust.

I'll end with two quotes from one of his letters in which he was ruminating on all the factors in his life that led him to this point.

First, "It's all too much pressure, and with all the secrets in my house, no one can help me put together the

pieces." And from the same letter, "I'm going to be fine, that's what I want everyone to know, whether they helped me or not, talked to me or not, like me or not, I'm going to be all right, so don't you worry about that. Things will work out one way or another."

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on Will's behalf. I know that there are others who could affirm some of the things that I have mentioned but are fearful of the repercussions of being involved with a case of this nature. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. FREESE: Next, Your Honor, is Robin Bell.

MS. BELL: I'm Robin Bell, R-o-b-i-n B-e-l-l. I have known William Chandler Byers Augusta since his birth. I refer to him as Chandler. His mother Kendra and I were best friends growing up. We were in the same Girl Scout troop, and we remained friends all throughout school and college. She is the godmother to my daughter.

I also met Kenny Hunter when I was home from college on a winter break and briefly had a relationship with him, but he proved to be unstable, so it was short-lived.

At an early age, I could tell Chandler was gifted. I recall a Christmas when he was about three or four, he received some type of interactive map, and days later he was able to name all of the states and their capitals. He was a quick

learner as a toddler, and all throughout his school career he excelled. He is also a very talented actor and vocalist.

It is my belief that things were not always as they appeared in the household. It always appeared that things were fine, but that was not always the case. For appearance sake, Chandler was always well dressed. He had the best of everything, clothes, shoes, toys, and electronics. He probably had every material thing that any child could ever want or need.

I do believe that the family was what would probably be called dysfunctional. I am aware of mental and physical abuse that went on in the household. Kendra did not freely admit to some of the abuse, but I was aware of it. Kendra was always yelling, whether it be at the kids or her parents. I don't want to paint a bad picture of her since she is unable to defend herself.

I do know that her yelling was most likely a learned behavior. Growing up, her father did a great deal of yelling at her and her mother for no apparent reason or not one that I could see. My experience as a parent, I find myself mirroring my mother.

I also remember on occasions I would talk to Kenny
Hunter on the phone during college, and his mother also was
yelling in the background expletives and calling them names and
the like. So neither one of them -- you know, this was learned

behavior from both of them.

I also do know that Kendra did not have the picture-perfect marriage. I often worried about her safety and advised her to leave on numerous occasions. I had known of abuse before they were married. On a trip on New Year's Eve, I had a glimpse of what it was as we were traveling down I-495 to D.C.

Kenny kept hitting on Kendra from the backseat and at some point had snapped off one or more of her false fingernails. I then told her to pull over and for him to get out. I explained that I was not going to put up with this and that we could easily be killed in an accident on this busy highway.

The abuse continued after they were married. There were several times when she would have me come to the house after an incident, but she really never talked about what had actually happened. Several times Kenny would take her vehicle and claim that he was never bringing it back.

At one point Kenny had won a great deal of money in a lottery, but instead of taking care of his family, he went and bought a Maserati. I recall on two occasions when I witnessed Kendra beating Chandler. On both of these occasions, I had to tell her to stop. This was not what I would describe as discipline.

The first was in the living room, and she had him

pinned on the floor, and she was beating him, and I had yelled for her to stop. The second, she had chased him up a hill and was beating him, and I could hear Chandler yelling and screaming and crying, and I had to yell for her to stop at that time.

I refused to let my daughter go anywhere with Kendra after a specific incident that happened at a local park when she was about three years old. When Kendra brought my daughter back home, I noticed that she was acting a little differently, and I asked what was wrong with her. She seemed to get very upset and proceeded to tell me that Uncle Kenny came to the park and was yelling and grabbing and pushing Aunt Kendra.

I immediately called Kendra on the phone and asked her about what went on, and she confirmed what my daughter said was true. I was very upset that my daughter had to witness something of this nature, but also it further angered me that Kendra did not bring it to my attention, she let my daughter come tell me. She just dropped my daughter off like nothing had happened. She had a way of acting like nothing happened or nothing was ever wrong.

I would say that when her family started to grow, that we hung out less and less. I don't ever recall going on any trips with her and all three children. I believe after her daughter was born, we were together less and less. We still talked on the phone, but we did not see each other as often.

I can honestly say by the time that XXXXX was born, we were only interacting through phone conversations. I never was around the youngest two as infants, and I was not -- even not aware that she was pregnant until she had the baby.

I do know that Chandler always appeared to be withdrawn and quiet, never made much eye contact. After he grew in size, it always appeared through his mannerisms that he made himself seem small as if he wanted to be unseen.

I can't remember any loving family moments as a family, no hugs, kisses, or such. His father Kenny never seemed to treat him in a loving manner. He treated him very differently than the other children.

Around 2007, Kendra and I had a falling out and we were no longer associated with each other. I only saw Kendra once in 2008, and that was while I was hospitalized after suffering an aneurysm. After that, we had little to no contact.

I had visited her when she fell ill and was in a coma. She then got better and came home, and we FaceBook messaged a few times regarding my daughter, and after she fell ill again. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. FREESE: And lastly, and I'll try and pronounce her name correctly, lastly, Your Honor, is Nichelle Chivis.

MS. CHIVIS: Good evening. My name is Nichelle N,

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

like Nancy, i-c-h-e-l-l-e, Chivis, C-h-i-v, as in victory, i-s.

Before I begin my remarks, I want to say and put on the record that Mrs. Parsons, Ms. Bell and I, we did not corroborate our statements in any way, shape, or form. And I'm saying that because I'm going last, and you're going to hear some -- you're going to see some similarities. And I just met Mrs. Parsons today. And I know Ms. Bell, but we don't see each other often at all.

I'm the godmother of Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter. I was there when he was born. In fact, I saw him before his mother did. Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter has been forced to endure endless stressful circumstances since his conception. I'm a firm believer that if a pregnant woman is under tremendous stress, that stress is transferred and felt by the unborn baby.

When Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter was born, he did not cry. His muscles were so tight that there was some speculation that he may have some dystrophy. As it turned out, he was fine. He did not cry a lot as a baby, and as he got older, when he would cry, he would often scream with his mouth shut. I always thought that this was odd and attributed it again to the stress his mother was under while she was pregnant and as a new mother.

Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter was loved very much by his mother, grandparents, myself, and the extended family. There was some disagreement about his paternity, hence the hyphenated

names, but ultimately it was determined that Kenneth Hunter, Senior, not Ruben Augusta, is his father.

Determining paternity was a long and stressful process. Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter was an unfortunate victim and witness to some of the situations that the adults in his life created. I never witnessed his father being affectionate with him. At best, he tolerated him.

In my statement, I didn't know if it was going to be submitted or read, but I do have a picture, a family picture attached to it. And in this picture, you can see that Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter was set apart from his parents and siblings. His parents are each touching a child, but neither of them is touching him. This is indicative of how I perceived his family there, present in the home but not engaged. It is just heartbreaking.

Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter has always learned things quickly. When he applied himself, he was a top-notch student. He was somewhat reticent, but I thought that was just because of some of the instability he experienced at home. His mother was a very ambitious woman before her health failed. She was always trying to advance herself professionally and provide for her family. Changing jobs every few years and changing the schools that Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter attended may have added to the stress at the time.

To my knowledge, Mr. Byers Augusta had a stint in a

mental hospital when he was in elementary school. He may have had another inpatient stay the following year. Although children do not come into this world with an instruction manual and parents make mistakes, his circumstances, in my opinion, were extremely unusual.

There was domestic violence in the home. He may have seen and definitely heard his mother's cries. His mother told me of one occasion his father punched him in the chest to wake him up. There may have been other occasions where Mr. Byers Augusta was abused, but I did not witness them, nor was I made aware of them.

Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter's status changed from being an only child to gaining a brother and a sister ten months apart in the same calendar year. A few years later he gained another brother. A lot of responsibility was placed on Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter as he got older and his mother's health began to deteriorate.

He did not have a stable and consistent male role model in his life after his grandfather passed away. His mother employed the flight response when faced with the fight or flight paradigm.

She would call the Carlisle Police Department to come calm Mr. Byers Augusta or talk to him after he and his mother would argue about something during his teen years. He was on juvenile probation and had to attend some sort of court-ordered

camp on weekends for a while. He was medicated unnecessarily.

I remember his mother telling me that the doctors were evaluating him for Asperger syndrome. I do not know what, if anything, ever came from that. Had a different parenting style been employed, I wholly believe that Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter would not be in this predicament today.

I noticed a lot of anger in Mr. Byers Augusta at a young age. It was very hard to get information out of him. He witnessed the differences that were made between him and his siblings. His father showed affection to his siblings but not him.

His mother did not have him circumcised, but his younger brothers were. That may seem like an insignificant difference, but it is a difference that was known, seen, and felt by him for a very long time. Kids do not like to be different, and he was made to look and feel different.

His mother did the very best that she could in most cases but failed as a parent in other cases. For example, she told me for years that she had Mr. Byers Augusta's name legally corrected. He has gone by the surname of Hunter for many years. His high school diploma, admission to college, et cetera, are all under the name of William Chandler Hunter. Apparently she was not truthful with me, because Mr. Byers Augusta, not Mr. Hunter, is incarcerated.

Any investigation of Mr. Byers Hunter is incomplete

unless all known aliases are considered: William Byers;
William Byers, hyphen, Augusta; William Byers Augusta; William Hunter; Chandler Byers; Chandler Byers, hyphen, Augusta;
Chandler Byers Augusta; Chandler Hunter; W.C. Byers, hyphen,
Augusta. You see where I'm going with this. Please don't
leave any stone unturned. There is something in his past that
has significantly contributed to him being incarcerated today.

Mr. Byers Augusta tends to withdraw and withhold information. Sometimes he makes very serious statements in a matter-of-fact manner. When prodded, he will share the information that you need. I have never known him to tell falsehoods. He is not being disrespectful or arrogant, it is just how he's accustomed to speaking.

It may appear that he has a lack of remorse, but that is not true, either. He has been downtrodden for so long that he does not possess the ability to share his true feelings about situations immediately. All of these factors, including his background, lead me to believe that he is not a bad young man, but a very sick and confused young man.

I do not believe that he belongs in jail or prison. I know that he needs help and may only receive that help in the forensic unit of a psychiatric hospital. As much as I would like to believe that correctional institutions are designed to help inmates become productive members of society upon their release, I understand that reduced staffing and day-to-day

costs don't support that ideology. It is far more economical to simply lock up our young men and throw away the key.

Please do not do that to Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter. He needs help. He needs help to find that little boy inside of him that had his childhood abruptly canceled through no fault of his own. He needs to be taught to comprehend exactly what has transpired.

Don't be fooled by the man you see here. He is very much a man-child. There was obviously a disconnection somewhere in his past that led to the behavior and actions that he is alleged to have committed. Please invest your resources into uncovering, identifying, and correcting whatever it is that led to the alternative reality that engulfs him like a poisonous bubble.

I am afraid that he will be killed in prison, quite honestly. Please do whatever you can to get him placed in the forensic unit of a mental hospital.

I love Mr. William Chandler Byers Augusta Hunter very much. I do not agree with the crimes he has committed at all, but love you don't just turn off and on because someone does something that you disagree with. I love him.

He has pled guilty to a horrific crime, and he must pay his debt to society. I am pleading for leniency and redemption for him. Please do not let his journey end in prison. He is a talented young man that could offer a lot to

society. He is academically gifted and possesses a beautiful singing voice.

He's also a sick young man that needs help. His parents failed him in many ways, and that is a big part of why we are here today. Please do not compound this devastating tragedy by failing to get Mr. Byers Augusta Hunter the help that he needs. And I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. FREESE: Your Honor, that concludes all of the individuals who wished to speak on my client's behalf. I do have some conclusory remarks.

THE COURT: All right. We did not make part of the record the calculations of the probation office. We should do that now. Everyone understands we begin with an offense level 43, criminal history category one, making for a guideline range of life.

I've received the sentencing memos of both counsel, and I know that there was one objection that counsel had made part of the record that we should address at this point.

MS. FREESE: And, Your Honor, you're, I believe, referencing my request to have a certain portion of the presentence report removed.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FREESE: That is correct, Your Honor, as I indicated in my objections, and I rest mostly on that.

Although we know that BOP policy requires that the presentence investigation report not be disclosed, we also know the reality. I certainly firsthand know the reality that these documents circulate throughout the prison.

I have grave concerns, which actually have been somewhat validated already by a couple of things that have transpired over the last 48 hours at SCI Camp Hill. My concern is that he is already vulnerable in prison, and I am afraid that he could be killed and that some of the information places him in grave danger.

We understand that the court must consider it as part of its 3553(a) analysis, but what I've specifically requested be removed was the detailed chat logs that were recited in the presentence report, on Pages 10 through 14 of the presentence.

So based upon that, I ask that it be redacted or removed from the report, fully recognizing that Your Honor, it is appropriate for consideration.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Berry, do you have a position on this?

MR. BERRY: Your Honor, our position is that it is part of the offense conduct. It is the nature and circumstances. It was appropriately included in the PSR, and the concerns about his danger can be addressed. The marshals have the ability to address that, BOP has the ability to address that.

And excising portions of the PSR that, you know, will 1 come back many years later to assess what was his original 2 offense, sometimes that's all we have to look at. And I don't 3 think it's appropriate to be pulling those sorts of things out 4 just because they're particularly heinous and disturbing, so we 5 6 would ask that it remain in the PSR. 7 THE COURT: Is there any reason why the probation office could not include the chat logs as an addendum to the 8 9 presentence report, in other words, an attachment? MR. BERRY: I don't have any problem with that. I 10 just don't like the idea of picking and choosing our facts. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask that it be 12 13 rewritten to be made an attachment to the presentence report. And obviously I, unfortunately, have had the opportunity to 14 15 read the chat logs many times over, so I certainly will consider them and they can be made part of the assignment. 16 17 Okay? 18 MS. FREESE: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Anything else you want to 19 20 offer on your client's behalf? 21 MS. FREESE: Yes, Your Honor, I do have some 22 conclusory remarks. Well, it's been a long and very difficult day, and, 23 24 unfortunately, the court has the most difficult task of 25 sentencing Mr. Augusta for horrendous crimes. I've reviewed

the government's sentencing memorandum many times, and to the extent that they summarize that these crimes would shock the conscience and that it may be the most difficult and worst case that the district has ever seen, I would agree.

The government clearly, in its 41 pages, Your Honor, wants you to see a monster, someone who is not a human being, and for that reason, they seek a life sentence for crimes that my client committed, by their own admission within the sentencing memo, when he himself was a child.

It's undisputed that this conduct occurred, as is cited in the government's own memo, between 2013 and 2015. It is no coincidence that the indictment in this case cuts off at my client's 18th birthday. It is the relevant conduct that is cited throughout the government's memo that the court has heard so much about that actually occurred when my client was 15, 16, 17, and 18.

And I'm not asking you, Your Honor, to jump to this conclusion that he was a kid or a juvenile. The Supreme Court has specifically spoken on how juvenile offenders are to be viewed differently.

Now, the government, of course, and understandably in its interests to advocate, maybe not explicitly but wants the court to basically ignore my client's age as a factor. In the 41 pages, while there's one reference to another case where a client was -- or where, excuse me, the defendant was 21 years

of age, there's really very little reference or focus and there's no response to the defense arguments as to our Supreme Court's rulings in the juvenile life without parole cases.

But, Your Honor, this case is different. My client is a human being. And the 3553(a) analysis requires the court not just to look at the nature and circumstances of the offense. And, yes, they are appalling. My client, by his own admission, fully admits to what he's done. He did so by signing a 25-page admission, something that I, as counsel, have never experienced, signed a 25-page admission that was filed with this court.

Other than his initial request for counsel at the time that he was arrested, he's always admitted fully and completely what he's done and the horrific acts that he's committed. But that's one factor. That's not the totality of this court's consideration, because the court must also consider the additional history and characteristics of the defendant, which were really, in large part, unaddressed by the government.

His youth at the commission of this crime truly sets him apart, not just from his co-defendants, but from the vast majority of sex offenders in this country. And from the cases I could go through in the government's 41-page memorandum, I pulled out their ages. These other offenders, they're in their 40s, their late 30s, their 50s, their 60s. They're not 18, 17, 16.

My client might be 21 today, but this conduct occurred many years ago, several years ago. As he reports in several -- to several places and which I would argue to the court has been substantiated, he became involved in sexualized chat rooms at or about the age of 12 or 13. The conduct or the subject of this offense occurred just a few years later.

Juveniles, Your Honor, are different. They're different because of status of their brain development and the ability for rehabilitation. And, again, I don't ask you to assume that fact. The United States Supreme Court tells you that. Juvenile lifers cannot — this is a direct quote from Graham v. Florida — cannot, with reliability, be classified among the worst offenders.

So while the government calls Mr. Augusta the worst of the worst and while the conduct is unbelievable and shocking, the Supreme Court tells us something different. Juveniles are not mature. They have an underdeveloped sense of responsibility, and they're more vulnerable and susceptible to negative influences than adults.

I'd ask you to go back further. What type of life did Chandler, William, whatever he was known to certain people, have? He had a life of chaos and tumult going back to his mother's conception. His home was a house of horrors.

There was a question of paternity. His mom was a liar, a secretive woman. His father beat his mother. His

mother and father beat him. He was punched like a man. He was deprived at times of food, and at other times he was forced to eat food and then his own vomit.

It wasn't just physical abuse. It was unthinkable emotional abuse. He was mocked. When Will was trying to figure out his sexuality, homosexuality, he was ridiculed. His dad called him a faggot and a shithead and told him to go put his mom's dress on. He was degraded, he was demeaned, he was isolated.

He tried to find friends, as his teacher and as some other people in his life told you, but frankly, he had virtually none. He sought acceptance, and he sought it in all of the wrong places, in unthinkable ways, and certainly with all of the wrong people. Your Honor, he tried to hang himself when he was eight years of age and was committed to a psychiatric institute less than two years later.

The government somehow questions this abuse, these horrors, and spends much of its time today and in its sentencing memorandum indicating that perhaps my client fabricated this for mitigation purposes.

There's argument that Dr. Krueger's conclusions are based exclusively on self-reports of Mr. Augusta that he was sexually abused, and yet Dr. Krueger told us that he denied being sexually abused. He acknowledged the behavior, acknowledged what he had done and his conversations, what he

had done with older men, men that were decades older, but he didn't characterize this as abuse.

It is simply untrue that many of these claims and these personal characteristics are not corroborated. You've heard from a number of sources and we know through school reports, psychiatric and psychological reports, of past suicide attempts and friends and family that these things happened. They're documented throughout his life. They're not convenient or motivated by an energetic defense attorney.

In his teen years, he sought acceptance in sexualized chat rooms, starting out at about age 12. He was groomed by pedophiles. He was cyber-sexually abused. Grown men egged him on, groomed him when he was a child himself. There's a significant point here, and it's a delicate one, but it's a significant point.

The investigation, the forensic evidence recovered by the government in this case, the indictment, never captures the fact that my client was a juvenile that was preyed upon and abused by other older men. Why do I say that? Because, of course, it's the government's discretion who they prosecute and who they don't, but no one has really talked about that fact.

When my client -- and this is undisputed because the forensic evidence bears it out. We see cases in this district all the time where the government says the victim is 15, 16, this is a child. Well, we know from the forensic evidence that

my client was also that same child, and he was having sex, talking with, whether it was cyber or live, with 40-, 50-, 60-year-old men. That conduct goes unmentioned. And it is, I would argue, significant.

There is a need here to promote just punishment, afford adequate deterrence, and promote respect for the law. I couldn't agree more with the government that the punishment should fit the crime, but less than a life sentence for what I'm going to characterize as a juvenile, meaning an individual under 25 years old, with a still-developing brain, can accomplish that.

For someone who commits even the most heinous crime, in this case, Mr. Augusta, a sentence of less than life is sufficient but not greater than necessary, and the court must consider the need here for total punishment.

Now, the government cites in its memorandum the case of United States v. Goff and urges this court not to impose a sentence, quote, too lenient. Well, in Goff, Your Honor, the court imposed a four-month sentence for possession of child pornography. And I would submit that that is entirely unhelpful to the court and not remotely similar to the nature of the crime here.

Not once in this memorandum -- and it is a 3553(a) factor that this court consider total punishment. Mr. Augusta is serving the equivalent of a life sentence that was imposed

by a separate sovereign. He is serving, in state prison, a sentence of 45 to 90 years. If he is paroled at his minimum, which is the greatest of greatest leaps in this case, he would be roughly 65 years of age.

If Pennsylvania at the time, depending upon the politics, the governor, actually would follow the Truth In Sentencing Act policy and provisions, well, then Mr. Augusta would be roughly 96 years of age when he's released from custody on his state sentence. Mr. Augusta will surely serve past his minimum for these violent sex crimes. And this is a factor, Your Honor, that the court should, and I would argue must, consider.

With respect to the unwarranted sentencing disparities, if there's one thing that frankly I've always thought, but when I look through all of the cases cited by the government and all of the cases that our office has certainly experienced, what we know is this:

Each case requires an individualized analysis of the person who committed the crimes, of the 3553(a) factors. Like Mr. Berry and Ms. Taylor could go through and cite ten cases or maybe even a hundred where a life sentence was imposed for a heinous crime, I could come up with a hundred more where there was a significant variance because of an individualized factor. That is the challenge, frankly, with these types of cases.

In the cases, however -- and I did make every effort

to look up many of them. I pulled dockets and spent hours on PACER pulling up documents from all over the country because I was interested in one thing: When the court conducted the individualized assessment in any of these cases, were the individuals 16, 17, 18, when they committed the crimes, were they 20, 21, 22. And the overwhelming majority of the cases I was actually able to pull within 24 hours tell me that, no, the individualized assessment, one of the characteristics there, these defendants were 40, 45, 50. They were two to three times my client's age at the time that they committed the offenses, and that, Your Honor, is extremely relevant.

Even the co-defendants in this case, there is one co-defendant who is very close in age, and that's Matthew Fensler. And he was -- I believe my spreadsheet reveals he's 25 years of age based on his date of birth. He is the only defendant, even though there's still an age gap, that is similarly situated age-wise.

You heard from Dr. Krueger. And obviously, as to be expected, he's been rigorously cross-examined. I would argue to Your Honor, though, that he is credible. He's Harvard educated. He's the medical director of the Sexual Behavior Clinic, works for the New York Psychiatric Institute, travels the world, educates, and he's been conducting, over the course of his career, really thousands of assessments.

And his professional opinion is that my client's

attitude towards treatment is positive, that he's bright -- and that's been corroborated through a number of different sources -- he's cooperated, he's motivated, and that he's an excellent candidate for therapy.

We recognize, and I think this needs to be mentioned, Your Honor, that there's an emphasis and I would expect an argument to be made that Dr. Krueger is completely incredible based upon his opinion, which frankly I give him credit for, that William could be treated in society. He wasn't asked to provide any opinion with respect to society's interest on punishment. Obviously there's a separate interest there. He's a sex offender counselor, and that was the nature of his evaluation. He was looking at him for purposes of treatment.

He is vulnerable in prison, and it's worth mentioning to the court that his trip to SCI Camp Hill has been absolute hell. He is in the special housing unit now after being harassed over loudspeakers, not just by correctional officers but by other inmates. His cellmate was afraid that he was going to be murdered because Will was absolutely viral during this transport for the sentencing proceeding.

So this fear that my client has or this concern or opinion that Dr. Krueger has appears to already be manifesting itself. He didn't particularly have problems at Cumberland County Prison, but as we've discussed, a state prison is a whole different can of worms.

He will be -- his home jail, so to speak, is SCI Forest, but the transport that he's experienced here and the circumstances when I saw him in the special housing unit have truly been frightening. He checked himself into the special housing unit when another inmate came up to him and said, you could be killed tonight or you check yourself in. And Will wasn't sure what he wanted to do but ultimately decided to check himself in.

He's troubled, Your Honor. He's sick, and he needs treatment. He has multiple mental health diagnoses, multiple sexual disorders, and, as we know, a still-developing brain. For all of these reasons, Your Honor, we ask you to impose a sentence of a term of years, not to impose a life sentence on Mr. Augusta.

I do believe, Your Honor, that this case is remarkable in several ways, and I can't, as his counsel, really honestly agree more with the government in its characterization of the conduct here. It is absolutely shocking. But we are asking Your Honor to consider that term of years because we believe that it is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

As the presentence report sets forth, such a sentence under Chapter 5 of the guideline range shall run concurrently because he is incarcerated for wholly related conduct. We ask for that concurrent sentence, to the extent that it doesn't exceed the state sentence, to -- that the court order that it

be served in a state correctional institution, as the state 1 2 does have primary custody. Finally, Your Honor, really, and in summary to what 3 these other witnesses, the few people that my client does have, 4 whom I commend for coming today, I would say this: He's still 5 a human being. He's a young man who committed heinous, heinous 6 7 acts, but he's a person. 8 And the Third Circuit, in a case that was published in 9 2009, which I cited in my memo, Olhovsky, indicated that the court cannot be so appalled by the offense that it loses sight 10 of the offender. And we're asking Your Honor to do just that, 11 12 to not be so appalled by this heinous crime and the offense 13 that it loses sight of the human being, William Augusta. Thank 14 you. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Freese, is Marienville the proper correctional facility? Is that where it is? 16 17 MS. FREESE: It is in Marienville. THE COURT: In Marienville. 18 19 MS. FREESE: So it's actually the State Correctional 20 Institution at Forest, is the name of the --21 THE COURT: At Forest? MS. FREESE: Yes. And that's where he's currently 22 designated. 23 24 THE COURT: All right. And you mentioned Mr. Fensler. 25 Do you recall what his sentence was?

MS. FREESE: Your Honor, I do have it right here. 1 believe that it was either 35 or 40 years, but I do have that 2 information. 3 4 THE COURT: Four twenty I am told. I had a chart of every single defendant in this case, and I knew what counts 5 6 they pled to and were charged with. Some were charged with 10 7 and 13, and I don't remember where --MS. FREESE: I do have, and this was, of course, 8 9 prepared by our report -- excuse me, by our office, that he received a sentence of 420 months. 10 THE COURT: And do you have which counts he pled to? 11 12 MS. FREESE: I do. It may be easier if I hand it up 13 to the court. THE COURT: Okay. Ten and thirteen was my 14 15 recollection, but if I could just double-check that. All This confirms my recollection that the highest sentence 16 right. 17 was 480 months to date, and that was Casey O'Dell. MS. TAYLOR: That's correct, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Does your client wish to speak? MS. FREESE: Yes, Your Honor. 20 21 THE COURT: All right. THE DEFENDANT: Never in a billion years did I think 22 I'd be standing in front of a judge for crimes I committed, 23 24 especially not when they involved hurting my family and the 25 people that I love most.

I know that those people aren't here today. I'm not sure if they'll be able to read any transcripts for this or ever get this message, but I would still like to speak to them, if I may.

To XXXXX, I want him to know that none of this was ever his fault. He didn't deserve any of this. I am so sorry. There's no excuse for anything that happened. I was wrong, and there isn't a day that goes by that I don't wish that I could take back the hurt and the pain and the damage that I caused him. And I just hope that he'll be able to grow up and still have hope for his future.

To my goddaughter, I know you're too young to understand what happened. I just, I hope that you can still grow into being a strong, independent young woman who will make your mother proud, and I know that you will.

To her mother, I betrayed a friendship and a level of trust that I know is going to be hard to forgive, but I hope that one day she'll be able to forgive me at some point.

To my other brother and sister, XXXXX and XXXXX, I'm sorry. I know I didn't treat them the way that they deserved to be treated all the time, and they didn't deserve any of this. I dragged them into my own stupidity, and I hope that one day they'll be able to forgive me.

And I also wanted to apologize to my parents. I mean, I'm sorry for the hurt and the pain and damage that I've caused

them throughout not just with this, but everything before this.

I know the things that I did have to be punished and should be. I'm just asking that you don't make me spend the rest of my life in jail, that you give me a chance, a second chance to prove that I'm not the monster and the animal who has done all these things and who all this evidence has brought before you.

I just -- I'm asking that you consider giving me a chance to make things right. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. For the government.

MR. BERRY: Your Honor, we've heard an awful lot about the defendant, and I just want the court -- I think the court has everything it needs before it. I'm not going to belabor this point, but the one person that has not really been talked about that much is Victim 1. And I just want the court to keep that in mind as you think about this sentence.

And then I have one housekeeping request that maybe is more appropriate at the end of the sentencing hearing, and that is that the transcript be redacted as to the names of the siblings that Mr. Augusta just referenced on the record. I think the rest of us did as diligent a job as we could about not saying their names, and I don't fault him at all for bringing their names up. That's perfectly appropriate. I just ask that the court reporter redact those names.

MS. FREESE: Certainly no objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, I have considered the 3553(a) factors, everything that I have heard from the witnesses, what counsel have said and written.

The balancing is, as counsel has noted, a careful one that in a case like this causes the court to have to separate from the serious and horrific offenses that bring this young man before the court and look at the person who stands before the court.

He's 21 years old, a high school graduate, a very smart young man who is creative and musically talented. Like a lot of people who come before the court, he comes from an absolutely chaotic home environment. He's the product of a stormy, abusive relationship.

He's had a little bit more guidance because he's had a grandmother, which we don't see in some of the people who come before the court. But he does have an abusive mother and a convicted felon for a father, so he didn't start from a good place.

He has no criminal history points in spite of that. The trouble that he managed to get himself into in his youth, unlike most of the people who come before the court, was not drug dealing or running the streets, but rather he found a place in chat rooms and quickly went to a very dark place.

I don't think we need to go over the events that bring

him before the court. He has a background of violent, assaultive behavior from a young age and a history of acting out on his pedophilic impulses and, unfortunately, victimized his own family member.

He's before the court for the production of pornography based on repeated violent sexual assaults against a small child, and as counsel has noted in the writings, the assault was unusually depraved, dehumanizing, heinous, and cruel.

I have considered the testimony of his witnesses very carefully. I note that the government has properly pointed out that a number of the factors that Dr. Krueger used in making the assessments that he did were based on the defendant's own incomplete history, and many of these assessments are quite subjective.

I take to heart what counsel has said and written about the youth of this offender. Much has been written and said about the developing brain and the lack of judgment that we see in people below age 18 that causes them to act in ways that sometimes we do not understand.

No matter what age this defendant is, I just find the conduct in this case incomprehensible, as I know everyone here does. It's particularly aggravated by the fact that adult men were made a party to this conduct. Strangers assisted in the abuse of this little boy. Mr. Stamm, who was sentenced only a

couple of weeks ago and whose voice we heard on the tapes today, literally terrorizing this little boy in order to get him to submit.

I honestly don't know how this young man got to that place, and I don't think anybody here, including Dr. Krueger, could ever explain it to my satisfaction. It is very difficult, looking at a guideline range sentence of life, to make the determination that no sentence other than a life sentence would meet sentencing objectives. I'm not prepared to do that here today.

I've carefully considered the other defendants in this case, their age, their own culpability, and obviously I must look at sentencing disparity. As I have pointed out to other counsel, Mr. Augusta is at the very top of the indictment for a reason. It is his conduct that is the most serious and reprehensible in the case.

I note that the other defendants are older and maybe could be arguably a factor in the conduct of Mr. Augusta, but I don't believe that's been borne out by the evidence. I do not believe that Mr. Augusta was lured into this conduct by adult defendants who egged him on and that but for their encouragement, this offense would not have occurred.

I've read the transcripts, and I think that he acted on his own accord. I think he is wholly culpable for the harm that he's caused here. I do believe that a sentence below life

does satisfy sentencing objectives.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it's the judgment of the court that the defendant, William Chandler Augusta, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 720 months.

This sentence consists of a sentence of 720 months on Count 4; 360 months on Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 13; and 240 months on Counts 11 and 12. All sentences are to run concurrently with each other.

The court recommends to the Bureau of Prisons that the State Correctional Institution at Forest or any other facility to which the defendant may be transferred be the place of confinement, thereby making this sentence concurrent with the sentences in Cumberland County Court under Dockets Number 2014, 2015, 2934-2015 and 68-2016.

It's ordered that the defendant pay to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, a special assessment of \$100 on each count for a total of \$1300 due immediately.

I find that the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine or additional assessment but order that he make restitution in the amount of \$81,891.95 payable to the Clerk, U.S. District Court.

Restitution is to be disbursed as follows: \$58,415 to Andy; \$5,000 to Pia; \$5,000 to Mya; \$5,000 to Ava; and \$8,000 to Cindy. The payment of interest is waived.

Restitution in the amount of \$476.95 is owed to the Pennsylvania Victims Compensation Assistance Program, and it's to be paid jointly and severally with restitution imposed or that will be imposed in the cases of Casey O'Dell, Scott Lane, David Sewell, Bruce Edgecombe, Moises Marquez, William Staples, Paul Stamm, Dylan Heatherly, James Reese, Jason Bolden.

No further payment is required after the sum of the amounts actually paid by all defendants has fully covered the compensable losses.

The defendant shall forfeit to the United States his interest in certain properties described in the charging document.

During the term of imprisonment, the restitution is payable every three months in an amount after a telephone allowance equal to 50 percent of the funds deposited into the defendant's inmate trust fund account.

When the defendant is released from imprisonment, he shall be placed on supervised release for a term of life on each count to be served concurrently.

If he is released, the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which he is released within 72 hours of his release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

While on supervised release, the defendant must not commit any federal, state, or local crime, possess a dangerous

weapon, or unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

The defendant shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the court and with the following additional conditions:

The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

The defendant must not have direct contact with any child that he knows or reasonably should know to be under the age of 18 without the permission of the probation officer.

If the defendant has direct contact with any child that he knows or reasonably should know to be under the age of 18 without the permission of the probation officer, he must report this contact to the probation officer within 24 hours.

Direct contact includes written communication, in-person communication, or physical contact. Direct contact does not include incidental contact during ordinary daily activities in public places.

A defendant must not go to or remain at any place where he knows children under the age of 18 are likely to be, including parks, schools, playgrounds, and child care facilities.

The defendant must participate in a sex offender-specific assessment. The defendant must participate in an offense-specific treatment program and follow the rules and regulations of the program. The probation officer will

1.3

supervise participation in the program that could include an evaluation and completion of any recommended treatment.

The defendant must submit to periodic polygraph testing at the discretion of the probation office as a means to ensure that he is in compliance with the requirements of the supervision and treatment program.

The defendant must submit computers or other electronic communications or data storage devices or media to a search. He must warn any other people who use these computers or devices capable of accessing the Internet that the devices may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

The defendant must allow the probation officer to install computer monitoring software on any computer he uses. To ensure compliance with computer monitoring, the defendant must allow the probation officer to conduct initial and periodic unannounced searches of any computers subject to computer monitoring.

These searches shall be conducted for the purposes of determining whether the computer contains any prohibited data prior to the installation of the monitoring software, to determine whether the monitoring software is functioning effectively after its installation, and to determine whether there have been attempts to circumvent the monitoring software after its installation. The defendant must warn any other people who use these computers that the computers may be

subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

The defendant must not communicate or otherwise contact the victim either directly or through anyone else.

The defendant must submit his person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, computers, other electronic communications or data storage devices or media or office to a search conducted by the U.S. probation officer.

Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release. The defendant shall warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition.

The defendant shall apply all monies received from income tax refunds, lottery winnings, judgments, and/or other anticipated or unexpected financial gains to the outstanding court-ordered financial obligation.

The defendant must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of any financial information. The probation office may share financial information with the United States Attorney's Office.

The defendant must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation office.

In the event that restitution is not paid in full prior to the commencement of supervised release, the defendant

shall, as a condition of supervised release, satisfy the amount due in monthly installments of no less than \$50 to commence 30 days after release from confinement.

The court finds the defendant poses a low risk of future substance abuse and therefore suspends the mandatory drug testing requirement. It's my determination that this sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the provisions set forth in 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a)(2).

I have considered all seven factors set forth in the statute. I recognize that the guidelines, policy statements, and amendments are advisory only. I find their application reasonable and appropriate.

Counsel, there was not a waiver of appellate rights, was there?

Mr. Augusta, you do have a right to appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary or if you think there was some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that you didn't waive by entering a guilty plea.

You also have a statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances, particularly if you think the sentence I impose on you is contrary to law. With few exceptions, any Notice of Appeal must be filed within 14 days after sentence is imposed on you.

If you're not able to pay the costs of an appeal, you can ask the court for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, and if you so request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a Notice of Appeal on your behalf.

Counsel, there was something else for the record?
Mr. Berry?

MR. BERRY: Yes, Your Honor. I've made a terrible, terrible oversight. In all the other defendants' cases, they all have plea agreements. We all have agreements about restitution.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERRY: Particularly for Victim 1. So my oversight is not noticing in the PSR that there was no restitution for Victim 1 in this case.

What I would ask the court to do is give me 90 days, which the guidelines permit, for restitution to -- from sentencing we can do an additional 90 days to deal with the restitution issue. And Ms. Freese and the government can hopefully work out an agreement on what that issue is, and, if not, we will litigate what the appropriate restitution amount would be for Victim 1.

But I would be completely derelict in my duty if I didn't try to get restitution for Victim 1 from this defendant in particular.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Freese.

```
MS. FREESE: Yes, Your Honor, under all of the
 1
     circumstances, we understand. We don't have an objection to
 2
 3
     the request.
              THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else for the
 4
 5
     record?
              MS. FREESE: I don't believe so, Your Honor. I
 6
 7
     believe that concludes it. Thank you very much.
 8
              THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court is adjourned.
 9
         (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at 5:50 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

I, Lori A. Shuey, Federal Certified Realtime Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-captioned matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Dated in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, this 31st day of December, 2017.

/s/ Lori A. Shuey

Lori A. Shuey

Federal Certified Realtime Reporter